DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 101 272 CS 001 554

AUTHOR	Bowers, John E.; And Others
TITLE	Identifying, Validating, and Multi-Media Packaging of Effective Reading Programs. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	American Institutes for Research in the Behavioral Sciences, Palo Alto, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Right to Read Program.
REPORT NO	AIR-41200-12/74-FR
BUREAU NO	BR-4-1200
PUB DATE	Dec 74
CONTRACT	OEC-0-73-7054
NOTE	148p.; See related document CS001555
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$6.97 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Educational Programs; Instructional Programs; *Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Program Improvement; Reading; Reading Improvement; *Reading Programs
IDENTIFIERS	*Right to Read

ABSTRACT

The major aim of this project was to develop dissemination packages for reading programs that had demonstrated effectiveness in improving reading achievement. The search involved a review of past research studies, computer stored abstracts, and library materials, as well as the obtaining of nominations from experts in the field and from the staff of educational, professional, and government organizations. Program information was obtained from a study questionnaire--the Program Information Form (PIF)--and from detailed program documents. The results of the search and screen tasks were: over 1,500 program candidates identified through nominations and literature searches were sent PIFs; 728 of these returned completed PIFs which were key punched and computer scored to rank programs on the basis of precoded answers to items pertaining to program evaluation; 27 programs were recommended for packaging and 222 were selected for the catalog. The 27 recommended for packaging were a small fraction of the programs reviewed but they were the only candidates judged by the American Institutes for Research staff reviewers to have met defensible standards for claims of effectiveness. (Author/WR)

ED101272

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

AIR-41200-12/74-FR

FINAL REPORT

Project No. 41200

Contract No. OEC-0-73-7054

IDENTIFYING, VALIDATING, AND MULTI-MEDIA PACKAGING OF EFFECTIVE READING PROGRAMS

John E. Bowers
Peggie L. Campeau
A. Oscar H. Roberts

American Institutes for Research
in the Behavioral Sciences
Palo Alto, California

December 1974

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
National Right to Read Program

CS 001 554

IDENTIFYING, VALIDATING, AND MULTI-MEDIA PACKAGING OF EFFECTIVE READING PROGRAMS

Contract No. OEC-0-73-7054

American Institutes for Research

Abstract

The major aim of this project was to develop dissemination packages for reading programs that had demonstrated effectiveness in improving reading achievement. Up to 25 packages were to be developed. In addition, a catalog of reading programs was to be prepared. The total effort can be regarded as one whose intended objective is to introduce change through the dissemination of information about effective reading programs and practices.

AIR recommendations for packaging and cataloging were based on an intensive nationwide search for program candidates which were then screened on the basis of program description and evaluation information. The search involved review of past research studies, computer-stored abstracts, and library materials, as well as the obtaining of nominations from experts in the field and staff of educational, professional, and government organizations. Program information was obtained from a study questionnaire, the Program Information Form (PIF), and from more detailed program documents. Initial screening, using a computer, scored and rank-ordered reading programs on criteria of effectiveness and on adequacy of program evaluation. Screening was iterative with successively more stringent standards applied at each stage; senior research staff conducted the more extensive examination of available program evidence.

The results of the search and screen tasks were as follows: over 1500 program candidates identified through nominations and literature searches were sent PIFs; 728 of these returned completed PIFs which were key punched and computer scored to rank programs on the basis of precoded answers to items pertaining to program evaluation (i.e., concerning criterion measures, statistical adequacy, experimental design, and other claims or considerations); 27 programs were recommended for packaging and 222 were selected for the catalog. The 27 recommended for packaging were a very small fraction of the programs reviewed, but they were the only candidates judged by AIR staff reviewers to have met defensible standards for claims of effectiveness. Even this group contained programs that compromised evaluation rigor.

One of five exemplary reading programs previously packaged by Right to Read was approved by the Office of Education but was not repackaged; also six programs selected in a concurrent Title I packaging project sponsored by the Office of Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluation were not candidates for AIR selection.

The search and screen activities described above fell within AIR's contract with Right to Read. However, during the search and screen and prior to Right to Read approval of AIR recommendations, an additional screening stage was required by the Office of Education Dissemination Review Panel (DRP). The DRP reviewed program description and evaluation information prepared by AIR for the 27 programs recommended for packaging. DRP approved 14 of these for dissemination and action is pending on 2. Of the 14, Right to Read approved 12 for packaging.

Package development involved 5-day site visits to collect program information for a filmstrip and sound cassette, a management handbook, an instructional handbook, and charts that summarized program processes and related objectives-activities-and-assessments. Information in the filmstrip provides viewers with program highlights and simulated exposure to classroom activities. The more detailed information in the management and instructional handbooks helps administrators at a new site judge whether the program is suitable for local implementation. The handbooks are also useful for inservice training of managers, instructors, and other program personnel, and as tools for them to use when the program is implemented. The two charts have similar functions, summarizing in capsule form the most essential features of the program. Intended mainly for program managers and teachers, the packages were developed to serve a variety of purposes and to be appropriate for a wider audience of persons concerned with educational programs (e.g., school boards, parents, community members). A guiderule was also produced that summarized 17 items of comparative information for the 12 packaged programs.

The catalog of reading programs contains 222 one-page summaries of basic information under the following standard headings: Program Size and Target Population; Year Started; Staff; Major Features; Facilities, Materials, Equipment; Cost; and For Further Information. The use of standard headings and the separation of program summaries into elementary, secondary, adult, and special education sections of the catalog, enables the reader to quickly compare information across programs. Taken together, these program summaries represent a wide range of approaches to teaching reading and provide a wealth of ideas that may be adapted to fit local objectives and needs.

Looking to the future, AIR included two sets of recommendations in the final report. The first set pertains to the need for upgrading the quality of local program evaluation and includes specific suggestions for improvement. The second set pertains to plans for disseminating the packaged programs. AIR recommends that a comprehensive diffusion and implementation plan be developed so that the exemplary reading programs packaged under this contract can be successfully implemented in new locations. A delivery system must be specified which brings together potential users, packaged programs, and change agents who can supply whatever training and implementation support new sites need, when they need it. In making this recommendation, AIR assumes that the packages alone will not cause anything new to happen. Instead, they must be activated by other components in a coordinated plan to help new sites select, adapt, implement, and evaluate these outstanding reading programs. A separate technical report, summarized below, was prepared on these aspects of diffusion planning.

The supplement to the final report, entitled Diffusion Planning for the Right to Read Packaged Programs, was prepared for Right to Read to use in developing an effective plan for interesting potential users in examining and possibly adopting the validated programs packaged under this contract. The six chapters in the document address key steps in the diffusion process: setting objectives for the diffusion effort, selecting sites where the packaged programs will succeed, getting information about these programs to potential users, finding out what sites need to implement them, supplying what sites need when they need it, and evaluating the effectiveness of the diffusion effort. Each chapter integrates information obtained from field interviews and from selected current literature. This information comes from implementers and researchers who have introduced or studied educational change. Based on these experiences, implications for use of the Right to Read packages are listed at the end of each chapter to provide specifications for developing a sound diffusion strategy--whether for a field test of the packaged programs or for a limited dissemination effort.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A project of this size, with a variety of tasks, requires the effort of many persons. These persons, necessary for the success of the project, included not only members of the Right to Read and American Institutes for Research staffs, but also the AIR Advisory Panel for this project and the many members of professional organizations, reading program staff, administrators, teachers, and other professionals too numerous to list who freely shared their time and skills in the search for exemplary reading programs.

Great appreciation is due the entire National Right to Read Program staff for their complete cooperation and support, but especially to three members who served successively as Project Officers. These were Edwin Caine, Sister Mary P. Hampton, and Edward Smith. Their contributions to the effort were valuable and timely.

Richard Nicklin and Donald Jordan of the Office of Public Affairs within the Office of Education provided AIR staff with full support, encouragement, and assistance in the preparation and approvals needed for dissemination products.

Special thanks go to Jacob Maimone, Contracts and Grants Division, Office of Education, who assisted the contractor and the sponsor many times throughout the project and always with thoughtful attention.

John Cavala deserves the warmest thanks for his valuable and instructive work as a consultant when he was needed in developing the program packages. Thanks are also due to the staff of Materials for Today's Learning, Inc., the subcontractor who worked closely with AIR in package production.

Finally, special thanks are due to Sarah Roberts and Laurie Ganschow who assisted in preparing Chapter II of this report.

AIR Right to Read Project Staff

Associate Project Director	James Snearer
Director of Evaluation	A. O. H. Roberts
Director of Literature Search and Development of Program Descriptions	Peggie Campeau
Director of Audio-Visual Production	Eugene Whitehorn

In addition, the following individuals helped to carry out project tasks.

Literature Search	Laurie Ganschow, LeRoy Jones, George Posey, Sarah Roberts
Search Evaluators	Jack Crawford, Carmen Finley, Gary Coles, William Shanner
Data Management	Bruce E. Everett

Document Acquisition and Systems Control	Caroline Dillman
Package Production	
Package Authors and Site Visit Leaders	Laurie Ganschow, Barbara Pletcher, Sarah Roberts, Barbara Sanderson, Carol Schalla, Mary Willis
Audio-Visual Consultant	John Cavala
Photography	John Hendricks, Sarah Roberts, Neil Starr, Robert Wilson
Art	Ronald Stout, Mary Tsukushi
Editors	Caroline Dillman, Phyllis DuBois, Nancy Guitteau
Audio Editing	George Posey
Catalog Production	
Coordinator of Catalog Production	Melanie Austin
Catalog Authors	Melanie Austin, Philip Clendaniel, Charles Dayton, Phyllis DuBois, Ronald Foster, Nona Gamel, Laurie Ganschow, Nancy Guitteau, LeRoy Jones, Janet McKenzie, Barbara Pletcher, George Posey, Sarah Roberts, Jean Wolman
Catalog Editors	Melanie Austin, Phyllis DuBois, Nona Gamel, Jane Spangler, Jean Wolman
Galley Proofing and Clerical Support	Melanie Austin, Emily Campbell, Phyllis DuBois, Alice Frimmersdorf, Sharon McVicker, Jean Reynolds, Jane Spangler, Carolyn Uyemura
Guiderule Production	
Original Design	A. O. H. Roberts
Production Model	Peter Dahl
Guiderule Art	Ronald Stout
Project Secretary	Jean Reynolds

John E. Bowers
Project Director

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vi
Chapter I - INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW OF THE PROJECT	1
Background	1
The Search	2
Criteria of Effectiveness	3
Instrumentation	4
The Screening Process	4
Reasons for Rejection	5
Product Development	5
Chapter II - THE SEARCH FOR EFFECTIVE READING PROGRAMS	7
Overview of Procedures	7
Program Nomination Form	7
Program Nomination Panel	9
Federal agencies, bureaus, regional educational laboratories, research and development laboratories, and the National Right to Read Program	9
State Departments of Education Superintendents, Reading Supervisors and Right to Read Coordinators	10
Local education agencies	10
Professional organizations and other groups	10
Special additional effort to locate adult and special education programs	11
Published announcements of the search	11
Overall results of the program nomination procedure	11
Literature Searches	11
ERIC search	11
SSIE search	15
ERIC/RCS list	16
Review of previous searches for exemplary programs	16
Review of current studies identifying successful programs	19
Overall results of the literature search	19
Combined Results of the Searches for Candidate Programs	23

Page

Chapter III - THE CRITERIA FOR ASSESSING PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS AND THE PROGRAM INFORMATION FORM 25

Criteria for Assessing Program Effectiveness 25

The Program Information Form (PIF) 27

Scoring PIF items 28
Response to the PIF mailing 28

Chapter IV - SCREENING EFFECTIVE READING PROGRAMS AND REASONS FOR REJECTION 34

The Sequence of Screenings 34

PIF Second Stage Screening 35

The composite score and empirical results 36

Statistical summaries of category scores 36

Reliability of the PIF composite score 37

Validity of the PIF composite score 38

Specific contributions to rejection 38

Samples of rejected programs with PIF composite scores of 36 40

Samples of rejected programs with PIF composite scores of 50 or higher 41

AIR Staff Third Stage Screening 42

Classification of reasons for rejection 42

The Dissemination Review Panel (DRP): Fourth Stage Screening . 47

Statistics in relation to the DRP decisions 47

Conclusions and Recommendations 50

Specific recommendations 52

Chapter V - DISSEMINATION PRODUCTS 54

Packages 54

Specifications for basic program information 54
Description of package components 55

The Catalog of Reading Programs 56

Product Review Procedures 57

Packages Produced 58

Guiderule 63

Diffusion Planning: A Look to the Future 65

Assumptions underlying diffusion planning 65
Elements of diffusion planning 67

A Field Test Plan 68

Assumptions underlying a local field test plan 68
Components of a local field test plan 69

Page

APPENDIX A:

Program Nomination Form . . . . . A- 1
Criteria Sheet . . . . . A- 3
Cover Letters:
Version 1. Program Nomination Panel . . . . . A- 4
Version 2. State Level Nomination Sources . . . . . A- 6
Version 3. Large City Superintendents
Professional Organizations
Other Groups . . . . . A- 8
Version 4. Adult/Special Education Contacts A-10

APPENDIX B:

Program Nomination Panel . . . . . B- 1

APPENDIX C:

Professional Organizations and Other Groups . . . . . C- 1

APPENDIX D:

Program Information Form . . . . . D- 1
Cover Letters:
Version 1. School Programs D-15
Version 2. Superintendents of Schools D-17
Version 3. Non-school Programs D-18

APPENDIX E:

Inventory of Program Data . . . . . E- 1
Outline for the Instructional Handbook E-19
Outline for the Program Management Handbook E-24

APPENDIX F:

Sample Program Description for the Catalog of Reading Programs. F- 1

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Descriptors Used in the ERIC Search	14
2	Previous Studies Screened for Program Leads	20
3	Results of the Search for Candidate Reading Programs by Major Search Source	24
4	Category 1: Criteria	29
5	Category 2: Statistical Adequacy	30
6	Category 3: Experimental Design	31
7	Category 4: Comparison Claims	32
8	Category 5: Other Considerations	32
9	Category 6: Target Populations	33
10	Distribution and Univariate Statistics of the PIF Composite Score	36
11	Univariate Statistics of Category Scores (before weighting)	37
12	Intercorrelations of Scores	37
13	Intercorrelations of Evaluators and PIF Composite Score (CS)	38
14	Programs Recommended for Packaging by AIR (N=27) and Results of DRP Review	48
15	Descriptive Summaries of the 12 Packaged Programs . .	59

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW OF THE PROJECT

Background

This is the final report of a project, sponsored by the National Right to Read Program of the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, under Contract OEC-0-73-7054, conducted by the American Institutes for Research (AIR) entitled "Identifying, Validating, and Multi-Media Packaging of Effective Reading Programs." The title describes three central tasks of the project: (1) the search for programs that were effectively improving reading instruction in the United States, (2) the refinement of criteria and the development of instruments and procedures to review and to screen reading programs on the basis of these effectiveness criteria, and (3) the development of multi-media products that describe reading programs in a manner conducive to widespread dissemination. A fourth task, one that is more often implicit than realized in similar efforts, was the review of diffusion strategies so that the products of the project might be effectively brought to the attention of potential users for their examination and possible adoption.

Central to these tasks was the definition of a reading program. As defined for the purposes of this project, a program is viewed as an instructional system ongoing at a specific location that is describable in terms of components or elements. These include needs, objectives, contexts, constraints, curricula, staffing organizations and policies, participant characteristics, facilities and plant, management plans, costs and budget, and procedures for evaluation. Materials of instruction, therefore, represent only one of the program components as defined here, rather than a "reading program" as often conceptualized by a publisher. This definition of a program certainly involves materials such as texts, books, coordinated tests and exercises, but for the purposes of this project these are viewed as materials used by teachers in a wider learning context. The context in which learning occurs, regardless of curriculum or theory, involves stimuli, motivators, active subjects, reinforcement schedules, and evaluation procedures.

The Right to Read-AIR project is basically an information-processing effort. The quantity of raw information about reading programs in the United States is not only enormous, but is available in a variety of formats

from many sources, and exists in differing levels of quality. Locating and obtaining this information was the search task. The screen-and-review tasks reorganized information obtained about reading programs into a common basis that permitted cross-program comparisons, that was objectively measurable, that was meaningful in a policy sense both to the sponsor and to the educational community, and that allowed educators and practitioners to relate program information to management, instructional, and evaluation objectives and operations. Screening criteria were operationalized through instruments and review procedures that sifted information for each program and finally ordered all reviewed programs along common dimensions of program effectiveness.

Although the search and screen tasks were concerned with information retrieval and processing, the project's main task was the preparation of program descriptions in order to disseminate information about effective programs. Dissemination is tied to the transformation and delivery of restructured information to potential users who in most instances share similar roles with the original instructional program developers. Thus, the entire project can be overviewed as one directed toward a diffusion goal whose intended effect is to introduce the possibility of change through the dissemination of information about effective reading programs and practices.

The two major project products are a set of reading program packages and a catalog of reading program descriptions. Packages were developed for programs that were judged through AIR screening procedures to be effective and that were also subsequently approved by the Office of Education for dissemination as exemplary programs. As in all selection systems, hits and misses occurred. Procedures, notably a sequencing of increasingly tighter reviews, were designed to minimize both of these kinds of errors.

The Search

Chapter II details the search for effective programs which attempted to spread as wide a net as possible in order not to overlook effective programs. Contacts with professionals included sending an approved Program Nomination Form to a panel of nearly 100 educators, teachers, evaluators, reading theorists, educational sociologists, media experts, publishers, and government officials. Program Nomination Forms were also sent to State Departments of Education, School Superintendents of cities with populations of 100,000 or higher, research directors, and numerous professional organiza-

tions. All together, 5600 nomination forms were mailed to these search sources (over 1300 addressees). In one respect, the search itself became the initial screening review, since nominators were asked to identify locations where reading instruction was taking place, although the question of whether or not the instruction was effective was deliberately ignored at this step. From the completed forms which were returned, 963 candidate programs were identified. The National Right to Read Program supplied lists and materials that yielded leads to 320 programs, and a national advertising campaign brought in another 65 nominations. Literature searches identified about 375 candidate programs.

In summary, over 1700 leads to candidate programs were obtained through the various search strategies. Checks for duplication reduced the candidate pool to 1520 programs.

Criteria of Effectiveness

Chapter III describes the criteria defined to process the information obtained from surveyed reading programs. Criteria definitions were based upon those listed in the Right to Read request for proposal (RFP). These criteria needed to be operationalized to allow comparisons of reading programs with one another on common bases so that they could be scaled in terms of their relative effectiveness.

Program criteria for screening included: (1) location within the United States, (2) operation for at least 1 year and the expectation of 2 additional years of operation, (3) availability of program evaluation evidence reported since 1968, (4) a focus on reliably measured reading achievement, (5) an adequate assessment design and statistical treatment comparing reading achievement gains for program participants with gains for a credible non-participant group, (6) adequate size, and (7) potential for replication. These criteria indicate that adequate local evaluation was a necessary, though not sufficient, condition for programs to be screened for dissemination. Ultimately, however, the quality of local program evaluation was the major discriminator between effective and non-effective programs. This condition sorted programs into the majority set characterized by faulty local evaluations and the relatively few who survived close examination, both by the AIR staff and finally by the Dissemination Review Panel of the Office of Education.

The quality of local evaluation became essentially synonymous with the judged quality of the program, because relatively few programs reported evaluations that were sufficiently sound to demonstrate conclusive interpretations regarding learner outcomes. One of the strong recommendations resulting from this study is that local evaluations must be upgraded. Evaluation should be conceived of as a management function that begins with the planning and start of the total instructional program. It is only through sound local evaluation designs that program managers and instructors can develop necessary feedback data for program improvement and can begin to determine which program components or elements require modification.

Instrumentation

Chapter III also describes the instrument and procedures developed to process the information obtained from candidate reading programs. The major instrument used for assessing program effectiveness was the Program Information Form (PIF). The PIF contained precoded, objectively scored items and alternatives as well as open-ended items. This format enabled programs to be initially scored on effectiveness with the use of a computer, and to be examined in greater depth by AIR staff review of available program description and evaluation documents.

A PIF was sent to each program candidate located in the search with a request for local program descriptions and evaluations. During the project, 1520 PIFs were sent to reading programs of which 804 were returned to AIR. Nearly 100 of these were incomplete; 728 were submitted to in-house data processing.

The Screening Process

Chapter IV reports the procedures for screening and selecting programs to be packaged and procedures for selecting programs to be described in the catalog. These procedures define the interface of information collection and information delivery.

Information obtained from the responses to 55 of the PIF items was summarized into six subscales and a total weighted (composite) scale. Scores on the composite scale initially rank-ordered the 728 programs who supplied PIF information in terms of overall quality with respect to the screening criteria. Following intensive examination of the programs

scoring highest in the initial rank-ordering, only 26 programs could be recommended by AIR for packaging, a small fraction of those examined. Of other programs located and reviewed later, an additional program was recommended, bringing the total to 27. A reliability check relating the composite score rank-order to overall quality of program evaluation by four AIR senior staff raters showed acceptable agreement. Subsequent analysis also showed agreement between the composite scale score and the approved or disapproved decisions by the Dissemination Review Panel.

Reasons for Rejection

Chapter IV also discusses the results of the screening procedures and focuses upon the reasons that programs failed the screening process and therefore were not recommended for packaging. Recommendations for the improvement of local evaluation efforts conclude Chapter IV.

Product Development

The two major products of this project, discussed in Chapter V, are (1) a set of packages presenting multi-media descriptions of effective reading programs and (2) a catalog of reading program descriptions. Since the purpose of preparing package descriptions for effective programs is to distribute information about them in a form that permits and fosters replication, it is obvious that the dissemination material must be conceptually organized within the context of a diffusion plan.

Each program package was planned to contain a filmstrip with accompanying audio commentary, a management handbook, instructional handbook, and flow charts. The basis for package development assumed that:

- Programs to be packaged were those judged to be effective.
- Descriptions were to be faithful to the program.
- Descriptive information was directed both toward educational managers such as superintendents, principals, and project directors, and toward teachers and other instructional staff.
- The same information was to be presented in different levels of detail. A filmstrip, which cannot carry a heavy information load, was planned to highlight each program's essential qualities, to enable the viewer to see classroom procedures, and to motivate

viewers interested in replication to examine the more detailed descriptions provided in the handbooks for teachers and managers.

A guiderule, summarizing 17 items of information for the 12 packaged programs, was also produced. This circular rule permits one to quickly and conveniently compare the programs on a variety of characteristics.

The catalog of reading program descriptions was planned to present summaries of the unpackaged programs that were rated highest on the initial PIF rank-ordering of effectiveness. Programs selected for the catalog were representative of different age levels and different types of participant groups, both in school and out, and reflected at least attempts to develop evaluations of program effectiveness. These programs, unlike those that were packaged, were not officially endorsed by the Office of Education for dissemination as effective programs.

Chapter V concludes with a discussion and general outline of a diffusion plan for disseminating, implementing, and utilizing the products from this project. The basic assumption is that it is impossible to design a spontaneously replicable information package. Rather, the packages and the catalog must be regarded as components of a diffusion plan that includes making potential users aware of these materials, coordinating their use with potential sponsors and adopters, possibly preparing special training materials for workshops and teacher training sessions, identifying key opinion leaders for implementation, planning implementation trials, and assisting in the development of an evaluation plan for installation and program modification prior to full-scale adoption.

Chapter II

THE SEARCH FOR EFFECTIVE READING PROGRAMS

Overview of Procedures

Right to Read's aim for the study was that a nationwide search be made for outstanding reading programs with sound evidence of their effectiveness. AIR was to look for any highly effective reading program, for any age or target population, funded by any means, sponsored by any institution or group. To scan such a vast array of possibilities, several systematic methods and special instruments were developed. In this section, the methods developed and used to identify leads to candidate programs are described in detail.

During the 5-month period between August and December 1973, about 1500 candidate programs were identified as a result of a very extensive search for effective reading programs. The two main methods used to locate candidate programs were nominations from the field and a literature search. The nomination procedure sought leads to outstanding reading programs known to members of the study's Program Nomination Panel, officials of federal, state, and local educational agencies, members of professional organizations, and other concerned persons who read notices of the nationally advertised study and wished to nominate their own or other programs as candidates. The literature review consisted mainly of two computer searches and a subsequent examination of microfiche copies of about 350 of the documents thus identified. In addition, suitable candidates for the study were sought in nearly one dozen major previous searches for successful programs. A description of these and other search sources is provided in the remainder of this section.

Program Nomination Form

AIR staff developed a special instrument, called the Program Nomination Form (PNF), to use in the search for candidate programs. Several cover letters appropriate for the group solicited for nominations were also developed. A sheet listing and defining the criteria for eligible programs was

prepared to enclose with the cover letter and the PNFs. These materials are described below and are included in Appendix A.

The PNF was printed on two sides of one sheet of paper. The form asked for basic identification and location information for the program being nominated as an outstanding reading project, practice, or approach. The nominator was also asked to indicate why he felt the program was exemplary, and to indicate the nature and source of evidence to support his choice. These questions were asked to increase the likelihood that the nominator would give careful thought to his choices. Generally speaking, the PNFs were mailed to secondary sources, i.e., to people who might know of programs but were not directly involved in their implementation. Several copies of the PNF were sent with each cover letter.

The cover letters that accompanied the PNFs were appropriately modified versions designed to communicate information about the study to the various sources described below. Each letter explained the purpose of the study and the extent of participation requested of nominators in providing leads to reading programs. The nominators were asked to consider community-based as well as school-based programs. The cover letters indicated that AIR would screen and validate nominated programs; this information was supplied in the hope that it would encourage nominators to weigh carefully the relative merits of alternative nominations.

The accompanying sheet listing and defining the criteria which should be considered in nominating reading programs supplied broad guidelines for the nominators' selections. These criteria indicated that to be nominated, reading programs must have been in operation for at least one year, must be focused primarily on improving the reading achievement of participants, and must make available recent evaluation data (since 1 January 1968). It was also indicated that, ideally, some evaluation data showing the program's success in improving the reading ability of participants was desirable. The reference to evaluation data was deliberately subdued in favor of encouraging nominators to suggest programs they regarded as successful and worthy of dissemination. Nominators were not asked to rate programs on these criteria because it would have been quite inappropriate to rely on the possibly inaccurate or hazy information available to a nominator in screening programs. Also, lack of comparability among nominators in applying rating standards would have made this procedure inadvisable.

Each group that was asked to nominate reading programs for the study is described below.

Program Nomination Panel. A list of panel members is presented in Appendix B. The Program Nomination Panel was an interdisciplinary group formed of nearly 100 members who were experts from several fields, including reading, linguistics, special education, learning disabilities, educational research, educational television and media, educational sociology, cultural anthropology, compensatory education, publishing, and government. The members were selected by AIR in consultation with both the internal and external advisory panels for this study. Additional members were identified from the files of National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) reviewers. Finally, membership was adjusted to comply with recommendations of the Project Officer and to make the group broadly representative with respect to professional affiliation or institution, ethnicity, specialty, sex, and geographical location. Geographical representation on the panel was roughly proportional to the number of children attending public and private elementary and secondary schools in each of the nine U.S. Office of Education geographical regions. Each panel member was mailed a cover letter, the criteria sheet, and several PNFs. Nearly 300 PNFs were mailed to this group. About half of the members of the panel supplied nominations, and on the basis of their completed PNFs, 46 candidate programs were identified.

Federal agencies, bureaus, regional educational laboratories, research and development laboratories, and the National Right to Read Program. Particularly good sources of program leads were provided by the National Right to Read Program and other personnel within the Office of Education in the form of lists, published series of project summaries, letters from project directors, and so on. These materials were carefully examined, with a special effort made to identify community-based reading programs. Only solid leads to programs were considered, and an attempt was made to get adequate address information when this was not provided. On the other hand, program proposals with no indication that the proposal had been funded or implemented were not followed up. These materials supplied titles and address information for 320 projects; as these were assumed to be suitable candidates, Program Information Forms were mailed to each. (The Program Information Form is described elsewhere in this report.)

The routine for all other federal sources indicated in the heading above was to mail a cover letter explaining the project, the sheet listing and explaining the study's criteria, and several PNFs. Over 300 PNFs were mailed to this group; of this number, over 200 went to community-based Right to Read project staff so that they could provide nominations for more programs in the private sector.

On the basis of completed PNFs returned by these sources, 29 candidate programs were identified.

State Departments of Education Superintendents, Reading Supervisors, and Right to Read Coordinators. State Superintendents of Instruction were notified of the study, and their assistance in securing leads to candidate programs was requested. The cover letter in this case also included a query concerning the existence of state-wide test data that might indicate schools where good reading programs were operating. Reading supervisors and Right to Read Coordinators in each state department of education were also asked to nominate candidate programs. Nearly 500 PNFs were mailed to these sources and from those that were returned, 171 candidate programs were identified.

Local education agencies. Cover letters, criteria, and over 500 PNFs were mailed to 182 school superintendents in cities with populations of 100,000 or higher. The superintendents were asked to use the PNFs if they knew of good reading programs for adults, handicapped persons, institutionalized participants, or other selected groups which are not typically included in searches of this type. From the completed PNFs returned by these local education agencies, an additional 128 candidate programs were identified.

Professional organizations and other groups. Nearly 4000 PNFs were mailed to state affiliates of national professional organizations and to other groups which might be promising sources of leads to exemplary reading projects. A complete list of these groups is contained in Appendix C. Many of these groups were contacted as part of AIR's intensified search for adult programs, special education programs, and programs operating in the community rather than in school settings. Publishers, contacted individually and through the President of the American Association of Publishers, were treated as any other nomination source. That is, they were asked to use the PNF to indicate a specific site where their program or materials were being used with outstanding success. The other national professional groups included organizations of teachers, administrators, school board officials, univer-

sity extension personnel, black professionals, reading specialists, and so on. All together, the PNFs returned by members of these organizations and groups provided 589 candidate reading programs for the study.

Special additional effort to locate adult and special education programs. Although the cover letters asked for nominations for community-based programs as well as those operating in schools, very few nominations for the former were received. With the assistance of Right to Read, additional groups thought to be good sources for such nominations were contacted. These groups are included in the list in Appendix C. Also, organizations that had not responded to initial contacts were recontacted and urged to send in these nominations.

Published announcements of the search. Professional organizations were also provided with advertising copy to use for a published announcement in their newsletters, bulletins, and journals. About 65 programs were nominated by people who read this advertisement or heard about the study in some other way.

Overall results of the program nomination procedure. A total of approximately 5600 PNFs were mailed to the above search sources. From the completed PNFs which were returned, 963 candidate programs were identified. In addition, the lists and materials obtained from the National Right to Read Program yielded leads to 320 programs, and the national advertising campaign brought in another 65 nominations. In summary, 1348 candidate programs were identified through the search strategies described above. Many more programs were added to the pool of prospective candidates as a result of the review of literature described below.

Literature Searches

The literature review consisted mainly of two computerized searches and a review of major previous searches for successful programs. Descriptions of literature sources and the methods used to search them are detailed below.

ERIC search. One computer search focused on the data base of educational research reports cataloged in monthly issues of Research in Education (RIE), which contain abstracts of recently completed research or research-related reports. The RIE data base is maintained by the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) and is supported by the U.S. Office of Education. ERIC

is a national network of clearinghouses that acquire, abstract, index, store, retrieve, and disseminate educational research reports and program descriptions. To assist users in retrieving the stored information, ERIC has published a Thesaurus of ERIC Descriptors, a compilation of education terms used to index, enter, and retrieve documents in the ERIC system. The Thesaurus was consulted to develop a list of descriptors for use in retrieving research and research-related documents that focused on reading. Printouts were requested in abstract format. The remainder of this section on the ERIC search describes the strategies employed for refining the computer search, for screening the abstracts provided on the printout, and for using microfiche copies of the documents to obtain identification information required before mail inquiries could be sent to candidate programs.

To trouble-shoot the computer search strategy developed to identify pertinent documents, a mini-search of the January through July 1973 RIE file was run by the Institute of Library Research in Berkeley, California, at no cost to the project. Fifty-nine reading-related descriptors from the ERIC Thesaurus were used in the mini-search and 1053 abstracts were retrieved. Two AIR staff members then independently screened a random sample of 200 abstracts from the 1053 listed. Criteria for screening each abstract in this sample were that instruction in reading or language arts was reported, and that evaluation was attempted. Abstracts were sorted into categories of "Good," "Questionable," and "Bad." Rater cross-classifications showed approximately 75% agreement. Abstracts with conflicting "Good" and "Bad" ratings were reexamined to increase rater agreement.

In addition to being used as a training device for the raters, the mini-search printout was analyzed to edit the descriptor list prior to submitting it for the major searches. The analysis indicated that use of a single set of descriptors to identify reading programs retrieved an excessive number of irrelevant documents, and suggested that crossing these terms with a second set of descriptors composed of evaluation terms would have retrieved a more relevant set of documents for further study. It was also determined that by crossing the two sets of terms, the retrieval set in the full-scale computer search of RIE abstracts could be reduced from approximately 10,000 documents to 3500--a large but more pertinent set of documents. It was felt that this limited set would provide a higher percentage of solid leads to outstanding reading programs with evidence to support claims of effectiveness, a result consistent with Right to Read's aims for the

study. Of the 6500 additional documents which would not be retrieved because they did not carry evaluation terms, the most successful reading programs in this group were likely to be nominated through one of the several other search strategies employed in this study.

As a result of the above analysis, three additional descriptors were added to the original list of reading-related descriptors, and a list of evaluation terms was prepared. The reading-related descriptors and the evaluation descriptors with which they were crossed to reduce the retrieval set are shown in Table 1. These two lists were submitted to the Lockheed Information Retrieval Service with a request for a search of the RIE data base (1968 on). The printout from this search contained 3305 abstracts.

Three AIR staff members trained in the abstract review process scanned this printout to identify and eliminate obvious irrelevant entries, to note entries which appeared to be leads to candidate programs, and to identify questionable entries for rescreening. As in the mini-search, the three classifications were "Good," "Questionable," and "Bad." To be classified as "Good," the abstract had to confirm that the focus was on reading instruction and evaluation, and that the program operated in the United States or its territories. After all the abstracts were read and classified, an inter-rater reliability check was made. Agreement was better than 80%, higher by more than 5% than the inter-rater reliability found in the mini-search. Re-screening of the "Questionable" abstracts resulted in their classification as either "Good" or "Bad."

From the 3305 ERIC abstracts examined in this way, 330 (about 10%) were felt to provide leads to candidate reading programs. However, this could not be confirmed without examining microfiche copies of the abstracted documents. To do this, microfiche for all the "Good" ERIC abstracts were located at the Stanford University ERIC Clearinghouse and read to obtain program identification information necessary for mailing follow-up inquiries. The following information was obtained, if available, from each microfiche and copied on a card: program title, program director, program address, director's telephone number, school district, school district address and telephone, target population, and date of document or the year of program operation described in the document. The cards were then used to determine programs

TABLE 1

Descriptors Used in the ERIC Search

Reading-Related Descriptors:

- Achievement Gains
- Adult Basic Education
- Adult Development
- Adult Education
- Adult Education Programs
- Adult Learning
- Adult Literacy
- Adult Reading Programs
- After School Centers
- After School Education
- After School Programs
- Basic Reading
- Beginning Reading
- Community Education
- Correctional Education
- Corrective Reading
- Curriculum Evaluation
- Developmental Reading
- Directed Reading
- Early Childhood Education
- Early Reading
- Functional Illiteracy
- Functional Reading
- Individualized Reading
- Inplant Programs
- Labor Education
- Language Ability
- Language Arts
- Language Experience Approach
- Language Skills
- Literacy Education
- Migrant Adult Education
- Migrant Child Education
- Migrant Education
- Phonics
- Prereading Experience
- Preschool Clinics
- Preschool Education
- Preschool Evaluation
- Preschool Programs
- Reading
- Reading Ability
- Reading Achievement
- Reading Centers
- Reading Clinics
- Reading Comprehension
- Reading Development
- Reading Improvement
- Reading Instruction
- Reading Programs
- Reading Readiness
- Reading Skills
- Remedial Instruction
- Remedial Programs
- Remedial Reading
- Remedial Reading Clinics
- Remedial Reading Programs
- Rural Education
- Study Centers
- Ungraded Curriculum
- Ungraded Elementary Programs
- Ungraded Primary Programs

(Continued)

TABLE 1 (Continued)

Evaluation-Related Descriptors:

Achievement	Measurement
Analysis of Covariance	Multiple Regression Analysis
Analysis of Variance	Profile Evaluation
Classroom Research	Program Effectiveness
Curriculum Research	Program Evaluation
Educational Experiments	Reading Research
Evaluation	Research
Exceptional Child Research	Research Methodology
Experimental Groups	Research Projects

to which follow-up inquiries would be mailed. This involved a further selection process to eliminate the following types of leads: (1) program leads contained in abstracts of documents published before 1968 or which described a project operating prior to 1968; (2) program leads for which documents did not supply enough address information to permit follow-up; (3) program leads for which address information indicated the program operated outside the United States; and (4) program leads which duplicated those found in the search of previous studies described later in this section. The results of this screening yielded 136 candidate programs. This figure was modified when checked for duplication against program nomination sources. Follow-up consisted of mailing Program Information Forms directly to the programs identified, unless a document dealt with the evaluation of two or more programs. In these cases, the evaluator or author was mailed a Program Nomination Form so that he could specify the project site and the appropriate person to whom a Program Information Form should be mailed.

SSIE search. A second computer search was designed to identify reading research projects in the Smithsonian Science Information Exchange (SSIE) data base of basic and applied research in life, physical, social, behavioral, and engineering sciences. The addition of the SSIE data base to the computerized literature search was necessary in order to canvass reading research projects currently in progress and funded by both public and private sources of support.

The ERIC data base was estimated to be deficient in both these respects. The same two lists of descriptors that were used in the ERIC search were submitted to the Smithsonian Science Information Exchange to adapt for use in searching their files. The printout supplied by SSIE contained 345 abstracts for current projects. The three AIR staff members trained in the abstract review procedures reviewed and classified these abstracts, according to the same criteria specified above for the ERIC abstract review, as either "Good," "Questionable," or "Bad." An inter-rater reliability check was performed and further screening of abstracts in the "Questionable" category was carried out as already described in the discussion of the ERIC abstract review process. When the additional four-step screening process described above was applied to the "Good" abstracts, 49 were believed to provide leads to candidate reading programs. This figure was modified when leads were checked for duplication against program nomination sources.

ERIC/RCS list. In addition to the computerized ERIC and SSIE searches, the ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills (ERIC/RCS) was contacted to obtain any further leads which might not have been covered. ERIC/RCS provided a list of index numbers of all documents in the ERIC system pertaining to reading, and this list was checked for duplication against the index numbers of each abstract in the computer printout. Index numbers for abstracts appearing in the RIE before 1968 were ignored. Using the same criteria as before, the 1468 abstracts for all non-duplicate numbers were then reviewed in back issues of RIE. From this review, 65 candidate programs were identified. However, this number was reduced by two-thirds when those leads were checked for duplication against other search sources, and when checked for adequate address information.

Review of previous searches for exemplary programs. Reports of previous research studies which had searched for successful programs were reviewed in order to obtain leads to promising candidates for the study. This set of documents came to the attention of project staff in a variety of ways, e.g., through staff involvement in much of this earlier work or knowledge of research carried out by others. In the course of reading abstracts on the ERIC and SSIE printouts, additional sources of previous searches were located. To identify a previous search on the basis of information contained in the abstract, the following criteria were applied: (1) Was there any indication

that a survey was made? (2) Were two or more projects described? (3) Were some selection criteria applied? In general, if these three questions could be answered affirmatively based on information contained in the abstract, the document was classified as a previous search. Reports listing all Title I or ESEA programs in a particular geographical area (usually a city) were not considered, based on the third criterion above. Several previous searches which were located had already been identified, for example, the several AIR catalogs of exemplary programs in compensatory education.

For this part of the literature review, special procedures were developed to screen the reports of previous searches. When examining each of the several project summaries contained in one of these documents, an internal form was used. On this form, the reviewer recorded each program's status with respect to the initial screening criteria. Uniform procedures were devised for deciding various questions of program eligibility under the criteria. These criteria and procedural guidelines were as follows:

- Location--The program operates in the United States. As expected, almost all programs covered in these previous searches met this criterion.
- Recency and Longevity--The program has operated for at least 1 year and should operate for 2 more years. Since it could not be determined whether a program was presently operating from these reports of past searches, only those programs which had ceased or were scheduled to cease operating at the time the report was written could be eliminated in this screening. For the remaining programs, this criterion was considered "passed" pending subsequent contact with the program.
- Population and Size--Any population was eligible, but several programs did not pass the "size" criterion, i.e., they were not designed for all children at a grade level or cluster of grades. These programs were preschool or day-care programs which also failed to pass the "focus" criterion, below.
- Focus of Treatment--The program aims to increase cognitive achievement in reading-related skills. There were three types of questionable programs. The first type was the preschool program which was

concerned with "school readiness" and might include language arts but did not stress reading readiness activities specifically. In this case, it was decided to contact any program which used either a reading readiness test or IQ test to evaluate school readiness.

The second questionable type was the primary grades program which covered the whole curriculum, including reading, but did not particularly stress a special approach to reading. It was decided to contact any programs which evaluated student achievement in reading. If there was definitely no evaluation on reading, no further contact was made.

The third questionable type was the intermediate or secondary program designed to raise school achievement in general, including reading. It was decided to contact these programs if they included special reading instruction, especially if reading evaluation was mentioned. If a program was so integrated that it was difficult to extract a coherent unit dealing only with reading, in the case of either instruction or testing, no further contact was made.

- Evaluation--The procedure followed was consistent with that used to screen ERIC and SSIE abstracts. If a program evaluation was described, aside from anecdotal or opinion measures, the program was contacted. If no evaluation was mentioned, the contact was not made. However, if the report indicated that hard evidence of program effectiveness had been a precondition for inclusion in the study, this criterion was waived.

The internal form used for initial screening of programs reported in the previous searches also provides space for noting questionable aspects of the program that would clarify the reasons for screening decisions. For every program which passed the initial screening criteria, the name and address of the person to be contacted for further information on the program were recorded in a box on the form. These persons were later sent the Program Information Form.

The previous searches which were reviewed, and the results of initial screening of programs they described, are contained in Table 2. Although 125 candidate programs were identified in screening these reports, almost half of the programs were duplicated by leads discovered in other search sources. They were added to the lists of programs to receive Program Information Forms.

Review of current studies identifying successful programs. In addition to the published reports of previous studies which had identified successful programs, two current projects which were charged with evaluating educational programs were also reviewed. These projects were contacted in person or by phone in order to discover whether any of the projects studied met the initial screening criteria of this study. The results of these contacts are summarized below.

1. Cooperative Longitudinal Study of Demonstration Education Programs. This study was being conducted by AIR to identify the effects of educational approaches in various contexts. Discussion with the director of this project revealed that the data base was not designed to permit evaluation of any particular project, but rather of different elements of educational treatments and their effect on students with various characteristics. No leads to successful projects could therefore be obtained from this study.

2. The Development of Project Information Packages for Effective Approaches in Compensatory Education. Meetings were held with the contractor for this study to insure that projects would not be duplicated, and to obtain any other relevant and helpful findings from their efforts. No new leads to successful projects that were not to be included in that concurrent effort could be obtained, based on a review of project reports and materials supplied to AIR by the contractor.

Overall results of the literature searches. Well over 3500 abstracts and about 350 project documents were screened during the search for candidate programs. The computerized literature search of the ERIC and SSIE data bases yielded about 185 program leads. The list of abstracts provided by ERIC/RCS contained 65 leads. In addition, the review of nearly a dozen major previous searches for successful programs yielded another 125 program

TABLE 2

Previous Studies Screened for Program Leads

Source	Comments
American Institutes for Research. Model programs, childhood education.	Out of 29 programs published in this series, 15 were eligible for the study.
American Institutes for Research. Model programs, reading.	There were 10 programs included in the published reports of this study; five additional programs which were not published were also screened. All together, 12 programs appeared to be eligible for further contact.
California Educational Research Commission Study. (1971)	This research was preliminary to an application for a Title III grant to establish a program of innovative schools in three of California's largest school districts. Dr. James L. Laffey, then Director of the ERIC/RCS Clearinghouse, reviewed reading projects and recommended innovative programs to the Commission for possible use in the proposed Title III project. Although this project was not funded, the six programs described in the report had potential for further investigation, and were added to the list of projects to be contacted.
Crawford, J. J., Kratochvil, D. W., & Wright, C. E. Evaluation of the impact of educational research and development products. (Interim Report No. 1)	Of the 117 products summarized in this report, 19 were reading-related and passed the screening criteria. Once these leads were checked for duplication against other search sources, Program Nomination Forms were mailed to the product developers or publishers so that they could nominate a specific site or sites where the product was being used successfully.
Ed Fairs. (1972 and 1973)	The evaluation criterion was waived in screening these projects. Of the 55 projects summarized in these documents, 30 passed the initial screening criteria and were not duplicated by leads found in other search sources.

(Continued)

TABLE 2 (Continued)

Hawkridge, D. G., Chalupsky, A. B., & Roberts, A. O. H. A study of selected exemplary programs for the education of disadvantaged children, Parts I and II.	This study identified 20 programs which were shown on the basis of hard evaluation data to be successful in helping disadvantaged children to perform above their previous or expected levels. Of these programs, 13 met the initial screening criteria.
Hawkridge, D. G., Campeau, P. L., DeWitt, K. M., and Trickett, P. K. A study of further selected exemplary programs for the education of disadvantaged children.	This continuation of the above study described an additional 11 projects, of which 3 passed the screening criteria.
Henrie, S. N. (Ed.) ALERT: A sourcebook of elementary curricula programs and projects.	This catalog is a product of the ALERT information system of the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development. It is a directory to programs in 15 different areas, including reading, early childhood programs, English/language arts, and bilingual programs. First priority for inclusion in the catalog was given to programs with a rigorous evaluation to support claims for success. Others were included on the basis of field trials, and some others because they offered significant alternatives to traditional practice, even if they had not yet been strictly evaluated. Of 21 programs that were in areas pertinent to the study, 18 were eligible for further investigation on the basis of initial screening.

(Continued)

TABLE 2 (Continued)

LaVerne College Study	A report was obtained from the Reading Improvement Clinic at LaVerne College, which conducted a study of Title I programs in reading. Results of the study were contained in a master's thesis. In this study, 21 remedial reading programs for disadvantaged children which had been designated by USOE as successful models were contacted. Of these, 12 were described as still operating as of January 1972, but 11 had already been identified through other search sources for the study. The one new lead was added to the mailing list for the Program Information Form.
Wargo, M. J., Campeau, P. L., & Tallmadge, G. K. Further examination of exemplary programs for educating disadvantaged children.	This study found 10 projects which were shown on the basis of sound evaluation to be successful in helping disadvantaged children to perform above their previous or expected levels. Of these programs, 8 passed the initial screening criteria.

leads. These numbers, especially the number of leads supplied by the review of the ERIC/RCS and previous search materials, were substantially reduced when checked for duplication against other search sources, and when checked for adequate address information.

Combined Results of the Searches for Candidate Programs

The results of the program nomination and literature review strategies are shown in Table 3. These numbers include about 200 duplicate leads. In round figures, over 1700 leads to candidate programs resulted from AIR's systematic, nationwide search. About 80% of these leads were supplied by the program nomination procedure, and 20% by the literature search. The most productive nomination sources were professional organizations and groups, and federal sources--particularly the National Right to Read Program--which supplied lists of programs. The best sources of leads to candidate programs in the literature search were the ERIC data base and reports of previous searches for successful programs.

The most productive source of leads to candidate programs, therefore, was the program nomination procedure. However, the literature search supplied over one-fifth of the candidate programs and so may be judged to have been a worthwhile activity. The most economical source of leads was provided by Right to Read and other federal sources in the form of lists of school-based and community-based reading programs.

TABLE 3

Results of the Search for Candidate Reading Programs
by Major Search Source

Source	Number of Leads	Percentage of Total
Program Nomination Sources:		
Program Nomination Panel	46	3 %
Federal Sources	349	20
State Sources	171	10
Local Sources	128	7
Professional Organizations and Other Groups	589	34
Response to Advertisement	65	4
Total Leads from Nominations	1348	78 %
Literature Search:		
ERIC Search	136	8 %
SSIE Search	49	3
ERIC/RCS	65	4
Reports of Previous Searches	125	7
Total Leads from Literature	375	22 %
TOTAL LEADS FROM ALL SOURCES	1723	100 %

Note. The numbers in this table include about 200 duplicate leads.

Chapter III

THE CRITERIA FOR ASSESSING PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS AND THE PROGRAM INFORMATION FORM

Criteria for Assessing Program Effectiveness

The screen and review process was that of reordering the large quantity of raw program information on the basis of criteria for judging program effectiveness. Screening criteria were the key organizing concepts operationalized through data collection instruments and procedures that would permit comparisons on common, objectively measurable standards. The major instrument developed to assess program effectiveness was the Program Information Form (PIF) which contained precoded items enabling all programs completing the PIF to be objectively scored. The PIF and its accompanying cover letter are shown in Appendix D.

Information from the PIF, together with available program description and evaluation documents obtained from the local programs, served as the primary data sources for programs selected for intensive review by AIR staff. All of these sources, as well as direct telephone consultation with program staff, supplied the information used to prepare description and evaluation summaries for recommended exemplary programs submitted to the Dissemination Review Panel (DRP) of the Office of Education.

The stipulations of the National Right to Read Program regarding the criteria for assessing program effectiveness were clear; these provided a firm skeleton onto which it was relatively easy to put flesh. The criteria are listed below, with appropriate PIF items noted in parentheses:

- Location--The reading program must have been located within the United States, its territories or possessions (Items 4, 5).
- Longevity--The program must have been in continuous operation for at least 1 year and must also have had plans for continuing operation for at least 2 more years (Items 7, 8).
- Available and Recent Documentation--Program description and evaluation reports must have been available and based on evidence obtained since 1 January 1968 (Items 9, 10, 11, 20).

- Focus--Evaluation data must have been focused on cognitive gain and academic achievement (Item 6).

- Measures--The measures of program effectiveness must have been reliable and valid, preferably obtained with nationally standardized reading tests, although locally developed instruments with adequate measurement characteristics were acceptable (Items 13-19, 58, 60).

- Comparisons--A sound basis for comparing the effect of the reading program upon its participants must have been established. Comparisons of pretest and posttest score gains for program participants with an appropriate control group were preferable, although comparisons with a norm group or with the achievement of pre-program groups were also acceptable if these were persuasive and compelling (Items 21-26, 53).

- Sampling--Generalization from the participant sample to a defined target population should have been evident. In particular, the effects of attrition upon the soundness of the interpretation of positive program impact should have been minimal (Items 29-43, 59, 62).

- Size--The evidence of positive program effect must have been based on samples of sufficient size, on more than one classroom, and over more than a single year preferably, so that explaining results in terms of a single teacher or group of students was not a credible rival hypothesis (Items 11, 12).

- Significance--In assessing program effect, appropriate statistical tests and evaluation designs must have been used in summarizing the evidence. One-tailed tests must have lead to rejection of the null hypothesis at the .05 alpha level. Furthermore, educational as well as statistical significance must have been observed so that trivial positive differences resulting from extremely large sample sizes did not lead to claims of statistical significance only (Items 27, 44, 45, 47-60).

- Exportability--Instructional materials, activities, services, organizational details, and key procedural information must not have precluded the possibility of widespread dissemination (Items

28, 46, 63-69, plus two open-ended items requesting detailed staffing, objectives, and assessment information).

The Program Information Form (PIF)

To spare respondents wasteful effort, items relating to the four crucial criteria were placed at the beginning of the PIF and the least satisfactory answer for each was marked with asterisks. Respondents who had selected one or more of these marked answers were asked to complete and return only the first three pages of the PIF (which included identifying information).

Each of the requirements imbedded in the criteria above were measured by items found within the PIF. Some items could be answered "Yes" or "No," for example:

Item 6: Is cognitive improvement in reading and reading-related skills a major focus of your program?

	YES	NO	
Answer:	☐	☐	** (6)

For others, a range of answers was provided. In these cases, the response range commenced below the threshold for selection and continued beyond it. This was done both to avoid straining the honesty of the respondents and to permit room for flexibility in assessment. For example:

Item 9: Are evaluation reports (e.g., baseline test data, retest data, measures of the program's effect) available?

Answer:	None available and none planned	☐ ** (9)
	None available but initial steps taken	☐
	Available but not published	☐
	Most recent publication prior to 1/1/68	☐
	Most recent publication since 1/1/68	☐

In some cases, it was necessary to break the question into a number of parts, with "Yes-No" answers to each, for example:

Items 54-57: Which of these factors were taken into explicit account in the analyses of BOTH program AND comparison data?

Answers:		YES	NO	
	Age	☐	☐	(54)
	Sex	☐	☐	(55)
	Grade level	☐	☐	(56)
	Ethnic proportions in group	☐	☐	(57)

The Program Information Form consisted of three sections. Section I, "Identification Information," contained five questions to identify the program and key personnel. Section II, "Program Screening Information," was designed to permit immediate coding for subsequent card punching and computer analysis. Section III, "Brief Descriptive Information," was designed to obtain certain program information that was not amenable to a precoded format.

Scoring PIF items. There were 55 PIF items, starting with Question 6, on which programs were scored. These 55 fell into six categories:

- Criteria (i.e., conditions imposed by the RFP)
- Statistical Adequacy
- Experimental Design
- Comparison Claims
- Other Considerations
- Target Populations

For each category except the last, scores were derived by allocating varying scores for answers with varying degrees of acceptability. Information on scoring PIF responses is summarized in Tables 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9.

Response to the PIF mailing. Searches of the literature, together with responses to the Program Nomination Forms, produced a list of 1520 programs to whom PIFs were sent for completion. Of these, 804 PIFs were returned to AIR for data processing. Nearly 100 of these were so incomplete that they were unusable.

TABLE 4

Category 1: Criteria

(5 questions; maximum score 9)

QUESTION #	QUESTIONS	COMMENTS
6 **	"Is cognitive improvement in reading and reading-related skills a major focus of your program?"	Answer "Yes" essential.
9 **	"Are evaluation reports (e.g., baseline test data, retest data, measures of the program's effect) available?"	Five choices, but availability essential; extra point for "since 1/1/68."
10 **	"Evaluation data are available for how long?"	Six choices, but availability essential; extra point for "more than two years."
12 **	"How many participants or individual records are included in the evaluation?"	Seven choices, but more than 10 essential; one point for "more than 30" and extra point for "more than 50."
27	"How significant were the statistical results showing the effect of your program?"	Five choices; one point for "better than 5 percent one-tailed" and extra point for "better than one percent."

** Respondents who marked one or more of these questions with unsatisfactory answers were asked to complete and return only the first three pages of the questionnaire.

TABLE 5

Category 2: Statistical Adequacy

(5 questions; maximum score 8)

QUESTION #	QUESTIONS	COMMENTS
7	"How long has your program been operating continuously?"	Five choices; one point for "at least one year" and extra point for longer.
11	"Are the data evaluating your total program approach available for one or more sites?"	Three choices; one point for "your site only" and extra point for "more than one site."
46	"In this program, how many hours per week are scheduled for the subject Language Arts?"	Seven choices; one point if less than six hours.
53	"How large was the estimated program effect on achievement (i.e., the average gain of students in the program over and above the gain expected in a comparison group)?"	Seven choices; one point if "one-quarter of a standard deviation unit" and extra point if larger.
58	"What was the reliability coefficient of the test used to measure reading achievement for this program?"	Seven choices; one point if 0.7 or larger.

TABLE 6

Category 3: Experimental Design

(21 questions; maximum score 18)

QUESTION #	QUESTIONS	COMMENTS
13-19	"What measures have been analyzed to show the success of your program?"	Seven "Yes-No" options; one point for (14), Analysis of locally developed reading test results; also, two points for (13), Analysis of nationally standardized reading test results.
44, 45	"Are specific diagnostic techniques or instruments used to: (44) Determine each student's level of reading readiness or skill (e.g., his reading grade level)? (45) Determine each student's strengths, weaknesses, and difficulties in language and reading skills (e.g., difficulty with decoding)?"	One point for each "Yes."
47-52	"What summary statistics were used in the analysis of program data?"	Six "Yes-No" options. One point for each "Yes" to: (47) Means or medians, (48) Standard deviations or variances, (49) Covariances or correlation coefficients, (50) Frequency counts, percentages, or proportions, (51) Significance tests.
54-57	"Which of these factors were taken into explicit account in the analyses of BOTH program AND comparison data?"	Five "Yes-No" options. One point for each "Yes" to: (54) Age, (55) Sex, (56) Grade Level, (57) Ethnic proportions in group.
59	"What percentage of annual attrition or loss of students from the program was allowed for to correct for bias in statistical analysis (e.g., by eliminating from consideration persons who start the program but do not finish?"	Six choices; one point for any answer except "No allowance was made for losses."
60	"How similar were the pre- and posttests used to determine gain in reading skills?"	Seven choices; one point for "Only one test has been applied"; two points for either "Were parallel forms of a single test" or "Were consecutive forms from the same source." No points for any other answer.

TABLE 7

Category 4: Comparison Claims

(6 questions; maximum score 9)

QUESTION #	QUESTIONS	COMMENTS
21-26	"What kind of improvement or gain by program students was found?"	Six "Yes-No" options. One point for each "Yes" to: (21) The mean test score of the students exceeds a specified norm; (23) A mean gain for less than one year is bigger than expected. Two points for each of: (22) A mean gain over exactly one year is bigger than expected; (24) The mean of students in the program exceeds that of comparable students not in the program. Three points were given for response (25), The mean gain of students in the program is greater than for comparable students not in the program.

TABLE 8

Category 5: Other Considerations

(3 questions; maximum score 4)

QUESTION #	QUESTIONS	COMMENTS
8	"Do you plan to keep your program operating for at least two more years (through the 1974-75 academic year)?"	One point for "Yes."
20	"Are up-to-date program descriptions available (e.g., staff, participants, schedules, and activities)?"	One point for "Yes."
28	"By what amount does the annual per-pupil cost of this program exceed that of the regular district program?"	Eight ranges: two points for "less than $100," one point for "between $100 and $199."

TABLE 9

Category 6: Target Populations

(13 questions, used for classification only)

QUESTION #	QUESTIONS	COMMENTS
29-35	"For what target population of students is your program designed?"	Seven "Yes-No" options, including ones for "Mentally retarded," "Bilingual," "Disadvantaged," etc.
36-41	"Are 20 percent or more of your program students in any of the following categories?"	Six "Yes-No" options, including ones for "Black," "Spanish-speaking," etc.
42	"In which area do the majority of the program students live?"	Six descriptors on a rural-to-urban continuum.
43	"What is the average family income level of students in the program?"	Three income ranges.

Chapter IV

SCREENING EFFECTIVE READING PROGRAMS AND REASONS FOR REJECTION

The Sequence of Screenings

There was no single operation that identified exemplary programs. Rather, a sequence of four successively tighter screenings was applied:

- First, the literature search combined with the individual and organizational nomination procedures defined a first-stage screen to locate effective programs. Criteria related to program effectiveness, recency, focus, location, size, and longevity were outlined both for nominators and for AIR literature reviewers.

- Second, as indicated in the last chapter, responses to the PIF were summarized into five subscale scores related to indices of program effectiveness.

- Third, the 728 programs supplying complete PIF data were rank-ordered on the PIF composite score. For all programs with PIF composite scores of 30 or higher (78% of the total), available documentation was reviewed by senior AIR evaluators. Of these programs, 26 programs were recommended to the Dissemination Review Panel (DRP) of the Office of Education as exemplary programs. Of other programs located and reviewed later, an additional program was recommended, bringing the total to 27.

- Fourth, the DRP reviewed the AIR recommendations. This panel's decisions to approve or disapprove programs for dissemination were found to be consistent with the second and third stage evaluations carried out by AIR. DRP approved 14 of the 27 programs AIR recommended for packaging; DRP action is pending on 2 programs.

This four-stage screening procedure, imposing successively more rigorous selection standards, would appear to be justifiable and fair. While errors of selection or rejection are possible, as in all human judgements, the consistency of the agreement with which programs were evaluated at the various stages was considered to be convincing evidence that such errors were reduced to reasonable limits.

The remainder of this chapter will describe the second and third stage evaluation procedures and the results of fourth stage screening by the DRP.

PIF Second Stage Screening

As PIF replies were received, they were at once screened, obvious errors corrected, marks made to give the benefit of the doubt where called for, and the five categories of items described in the previous chapter were hand-scored. Those programs that passed all the criteria covered by PIF items marked with asterisks and had Experimental Design scores of 14 or higher, were given closer scrutiny. For those programs that appeared to be likely prospects, the PIFs were photo-copied and the accompanying documents passed on to evaluators for immediate review.

As a substitute for a pilot run, the first 65 cases were put through the computer, which revealed commonly occurring errors in coding that needed careful attention before card-punching. Thereafter, PIFs were accumulated in batches of approximately 100 for card-punching. Each PIF was assigned a five-digit identification number, with the fifth digit indicating additional reports from a single site. These code numbers occupied the first five columns on the cards, with coded answers starting with the sixth. Double-punching was avoided, and all card-punching verified.

When 287 cards had been accumulated, they were again scored by computer, category scores accumulated, and the summary statistics computed for each. As could be expected in view of its greater length, the Experimental Design category had a standard deviation about twice that of each of the others except for Comparison Claims. These scores were doubled for the categories, Criteria and Statistical Adequacy, in order to give them equal weight with Comparison Claims and Other Considerations. The composite score for the whole PIF was therefore calculated as follows:

PIF Composite Score = 2 Criteria + 2 Statistical Adequacy + Experimental Design + Comparison Claims + Other Considerations.

The first four categories thus carried roughly equal weights and the last about half as much as each of the others. This scoring system was maintained thereafter for all PIFs. A check on the summary statistics after 728 PIFs had been processed showed only trivial changes from those of the first 287. These first 287 were scored on the composite, the print-out showing not only composite score, but also the individual category scores and the individual question scores from which the composite score was derived. Programs were arranged in order of their code number, making

it easy to refer to all data for a particular program, and to begin the next stage of review while waiting for remaining PIFs to be returned.

The return of completed PIFs had virtually ceased, except for one or two a week, when 728 were received. At this point, a final printout was called for with all statistics; the more technical aspects are summarized in Tables 10, 11, 12, and 13.

The composite score and empirical results. Table 10 presents the frequencies of scores that resulted, with descriptive statistics.

TABLE 10

Distribution and Univariate Statistics of the PIF Composite Score

Scores	Frequencies	%	Cum. %
60+	1	0.1	0.1
55-59	12	1.7	1.8
50-54	51	5.6	7.4
45-49	84	11.6	19.0
40-44	139	19.0	38.0
35-39	133	19.7	57.7
30-34	148	20.3	78.0
25-29	103	14.2	92.2
20-24	31	4.2	96.4
15-19	16	2.2	98.6
10-14	4	0.6	99.2
5- 9	5	0.7	99.9
0- 4	1	0.1	100.0
TOTAL	728	100.0	

N = 28
Mean = 36.4
Standard Deviation = 9.1
Skewness = -0.3
Kurtosis = +0.3
(The range of scores 20-55 showed a close approximation to the Normal Distribution.)

Statistical summaries of category scores. From Table 11 it will be seen that Criteria scores had a mean in the upper half of the range, though with only a small amount of negative skewing. Infrequency of low scores here is due to the fact that respondents were invited to save effort and not to complete the questionnaire if several answers in this section were below the cut-off. Experimental Design had a relatively high correlation with the criterion, since satisfactory answers on Criteria scores were logically necessary to Experimental Design, so that here too the mean is fairly high with some negative skewing. The distribution for Other Considerations, however, is fairly well negatively skewed, with a mean located at three-quarters of the range, meaning that most respondents obtained

scores of 2, 3, or 4. In fact, only 42 programs scored below this. The high negative kurtosis was due to the fact that all 142 cases were distributed on the two modes, at 2 and 4. Comparison Claims had a low mean and relatively high standard deviation. Here too the distribution was bimodal, at the scores 0-1, and at 3.

TABLE 11

Univariate Statistics of Category Scores (before weighting)

Category	Mean	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis	Range
Criteria	6.09	1.45	-0.21	0.30	1-9
Statistical Adequacy	4.10	1.41	0.03	0.14	0-8
Experimental Design	9.87	3.45	-0.31	0.11	0-18
Comparison Claims	3.11	2.85	0.67	-0.72	0-9
Other Considerations	3.04	1.02	-0.43	-1.27	0-4
Composite	36.39	9.08	-0.27	0.30	3-60

Scale intercorrelations are shown in Table 12. The most noteworthy fact is that Other Considerations had very little relationship to the other four scales. This, together with its small standard deviation (1.02) and only unit weight, accounts for the low correlation with the PIF composite score. In fact, even that is largely the result of the part-whole correlation. As intended, the Other Considerations score contributes very little to the PIF composite score.

TABLE 12

Intercorrelations of Scores

Category	Intercorrelation with:				PIF
	2	3	4	5	Composite
Criteria	.48	.45	.35	.06	.76
Statistical Adequacy		.35	.31	.09	.70
Experimental Design			.44	.13	.78
Comparison Claims				.09	.70
Other Considerations					.22

Reliability of the PIF composite score. Correlations of the individual scales with the PIF composite score are, of course, all sharply raised by the part-whole effect. However, a conservative estimate of the reliability of the composite score can be derived from the matrix in Table 12 by assuming that the lower bound of the reliability for each subscore is the highest

correlation that it has with any of the other subscores, then applying an extension of the Spearman-Brown formula. From this, we find that the reliability should be at least 0.71 which would make the standard error of measurement less than 5 PIF composite score points.

Validity of the PIF composite score. A partial quick check, in the absence of time to conduct a large-scale validity study, was conducted by selecting 30 programs, 10 each with PIF composite scores of 30, 40, and 50. The documentations for these 30 were randomized, and each of four AIR evaluators, independently and without knowledge of the PIF composite scores, rated each program on a three-point scale (3=high, 2=middle, 1=low), solely on the basis of the documentation. Table 13 shows the interrelationships of the AIR ratings and the PIF composite score.

TABLE 13

Intercorrelations of Evaluators and PIF Composite Score (CS)

Rater	1	2	3	4	CS
1	-	.59	.35	.73	.35
2	.59	-	.63	.68	.55
3	.35	.63	-	.50	.40
4	.73	.68	.50	-	.59
Composite Score	.35	.55	.40	.59	-

If correction for restriction of range only is made, the lowest correlation of Rater and Composite Score (.35) becomes .48, and the highest (.59) becomes .67. The validity of the sums of all ratings with the PIF composite score was .58, depressed by course grouping (three-point scales), and also by speeded rating. Nevertheless, this correlation is significant at the 5% level. Thus, the agreement between the PIF composite score and rapid rater judgement is significant.

Specific contributions to rejection. Low PIF composite scores resulted from unsatisfactory answers to important questions on the Program Information Form. For example, of 728 respondents:

58% had unpublished reports or none

43% had evaluation data for a year or less, or none

62% did no tests of significance, and a further 14% found insufficient significance (Some respondents probably called simple comparisons "tests of significance.")

Of the 24% who apparently did find significances at the 5% level or better, a surprisingly large proportion were to make only the completely trivial finding that posttest results were better than pretest results, i.e., that some growth of unknown source had occurred

69% did not calculate standard deviations or variance

26% did not even calculate means or medians

60% took no account of attrition (loss of sample)

17% ignored "practice effect" and gave the identical test for both pretest and posttest--often 3 or 4 months apart

41% achieved their results, in part at least, by spending 8 hours or more per week on the program

14% achieved results by spending more than $300 extra per pupil per annum

18% did not use nationally standardized tests

61% had unsatisfactory information about the reliability of tests for their samples

The mean PIF composite score was 36, with a standard deviation of 9. All available documentation was eventually examined for every program with a composite score of 30 or more (78% of the total). Many had no documentation at all; most of those that did confined it to descriptions of the program, and included local newspaper reviews. A large proportion of those that did try to present data used simple frequency counts only, often reporting the softest observations such as: "Before the start of the program X teachers considered progress of pupils satisfactory; afterwards Y teachers did so."

Even when real data was collected and treated statistically, a mere test of significance of gains between pretest and posttests was considered adequate proof. There were obvious arithmetical errors. For example, in one case the sign was lost, and a loss over the treatment period was called a gain.

Several programs sought help from outside consultants, not always with profit. In one such case, the consultant found that in 20 out of 21 classes, posttest means exceeded pretest. The actual gains were minute, the largest being less than a tenth of a standard deviation. However, the consultant obscured this by testing the frequency of 20 out of 21 on the chi-square

test, and showed that this table was highly significant.

One consultant put wrong data through the computer, resulting in a demonstration of the grossest possible lack of matching between ostensibly matched experimental and control groups. The table reached us with incompatible discursive treatment of the data, and the facts emerged as a result of an enquiry prompted by a puzzled phone call.

Another consultant converted pretest scores to grade equivalents using the 1964 norms, but converted posttest scores on the 1973 norms. His erroneous procedure led the consultant to claim that program participants had made substantial "gains." What the 1973 norms do show, however, is how far standards have dropped over the past 9 or 10 years. A performance that would have been equivalent to grade 1.0 in 1964 is still worth the same in 1973; children entering the system are as good as ever, and even a year later are still "par for the course." Thereafter, they would be credited with increasingly higher grade equivalents on this well-known test. A performance on Reading Comprehension at grade 3.0 in 1964 would get a grade equivalent of 3.6 in 1973; 4.0 in 1964 would be a 4.6 in 1973; and 5.0 in 1964 would become 5.7 in 1973. By the time grades 8 and 9 are reached, the difference is more than a full year.

Samples of rejected programs with PIF composite scores of 36. Brief descriptions of five programs with PIF composite scores of 36, the mean for the entire set of 728 programs, are presented below. The five programs were randomly drawn from the 26 with a composite score of 36. Only one of these five sent any additional evaluative documentation, and two sent very brief descriptions of the program.

Case	Comments
1	Had no standardized tests in 1972 because of lengthy teachers' strike and could show no evidence of gains on the criterion, and of course no statistical analysis of any sort.
2	PIF responses indicated "Mean gain for less than one year is bigger than expected," but "No significant differences found yet." Program takes about 10 to 12 hours per week. No allowance made for biases due to attrition. Descriptive material and two tables of data; no sample size.
3	First grade gains were significant between 5% and 10% one-tailed levels. No significance tests for other grades. Program takes 10 to 12 hours per week. No account taken of bias due to attrition. Comparison with norms.

Case	Comments (continued)
4	Not known whether program will continue for 2 more years. With regard to kind of improvement or gain, "Information not known." Significance tests were said to have been applied, but no significant differences found yet, and no answers given about any other statistical summaries. Reliabilities of tests "not yet determined."
5	Evaluation reports "available but not published." Program in operation for less than 2 years. Significance between 5% and 10% one-tailed levels. Reliability of tests not yet determined. No account taken of biases due to attrition. Comparisons with norms.

Samples of rejected programs with PIF composite scores of 50 or higher. There were 64 programs with PIF composite scores of 50 and up. A random sample of 10 was drawn, of which one had been selected for packaging, and two for the catalog. One of those cataloged was rejected for packaging only for lack of detailed comparison and checking of its control group. There would have been difficulty finding a suitable control group because it was for vocational students. Apart from this lack, it was very well done, having one of the highest PIF composite scores (60) with correspondingly high values for each of the subscores. The other program that was cataloged had a PIF composite score of 51, Criterion 89%, Experimental Design 83%, but Statistical Adequacy of only 50%. A small amount of supporting evaluation was sent, though it was somewhat primitive (bar-graphs only) and inadequate. Presented below are brief descriptions of the other seven programs, with reasons for rejection.

Case	Comments
1	PIF composite score 50. Criterion 89%, Statistical Adequacy 50%, Experimental Design 83%. Good materials, good reporting and evaluation, but data inconclusive due to usual problems of lack of satisfactory baseline. A promising program for re-examination in the future.
2	PIF composite score 50. Criterion 78%, Statistical Adequacy 75%, Experimental Design 72%. No tests of significance; gain of a quarter of a standard deviation.
3	PIF composite score 54. Criterion 78%, Statistical Adequacy 75%, Experimental Design 100%. Sent no supporting data or evaluation; included a paperback book instead with only tenuous relevance to the particular site.
4	PIF composite score 51. Criterion 89%, Statistical Adequacy 63%, Experimental Design 67%. Little data and no analysis; gains in standard deviations too small.

Case	Comments (continued)
5	PIF composite score 51. Criterion 100%, Statistical Adequacy 63%, Experimental Design 94%. No tests of significance applied yet, as data not complete. Another program that should be re-examined when the opportunity presents itself.
6	PIF composite score 50. Criterion 78%, Statistical Adequacy 88%, Experimental Design 83%. No evaluation data or analysis sent.
7	PIF composite score 52. Criterion 78%, Statistical Adequacy 75%, Experimental Design 72%. No data, evaluation, or analysis sent.

AIR Staff Third Stage Screening

There were six evaluators, all with some background of statistical training and experience. At first, all programs with PIF composite scores of 40 or higher were examined by these evaluators, but later this was extended to include those with scores of 30 to 39. Before starting, the six evaluators met to discuss and establish guide rules. During evaluation there was also constant referral and consultation. For borderline cases, the telephone was used freely to obtain additional information or clarification.

Classification of reasons for rejection. Rejections were made because of serious flaws or lacks under one or more of the following headings:

Supportive documentation--A minimal requirement here was for some descriptive materials and evaluative data. Statistical analysis including significance tests was preferred, but failing this, some reference to testing and to accumulation of data was necessary. In fact, it was frequently necessary to compute elementary statistics such as the mean, standard deviation, and t-tests from raw data. Computations reported were also checked for gross errors that were frequently associated with spuriously enhanced claims, but on occasion incorrect figures or formulae were applied to a program's disadvantage (e.g., using t-tests for uncorrelated means, when the data were correlated). Gross arithmetical errors were not uncommon; one involved a reversal of sign converting a loss into an apparent gain.

Programs were not followed up where the only material received, in spite of a request for supporting documents, was the completed PIF questionnaire.

Hypotheses tested--These could be explicit or implied, the only requirements being that they had to be relevant and focused appropriately; i.e., they had to concern cognitive achievement in reading, and should not be trivial. An example of a frequently found but trivial hypothesis tested by innovators was that pupils achieve higher scores on posttests than on pretests.

Test used--These could be nationally standardized or locally developed, but they had to test some aspect of reading achievement directly, and include normative measurement; i.e., they had to allow meaningful comparisons of group performances. So-called "criterion referenced tests" were of little value unless norms had also been established. Measurements of affect, motivation, or attitude, while important learning outcomes, were of no persuasive value as central themes.

Sampling--While sampling is practical economy, it must not preclude useful generalization, and it must be large enough to imbue the generalization with sufficient precision. The method of sampling used had to allow generalization to a usefully defined population. For example, if volunteering was used to recruit groups, one is unable to generalize legitimately the findings to "all grade 3 students" without adding the restrictive qualification "...and who would volunteer to attend on Saturdays."

Samples of 30 or smaller are borderline at best, and had the further handicap that the results of activities of one or two teachers only could be represented. These were found acceptable only if there were strong additional arguments.

The chart on the following page was used as a guide to acceptable sampling practice.

TREATMENT	COMPARISON: BLOCKED MATCHED GROUPS	PREVIOUS PERFORMANCE	RANDOM SAMPLING	BLOCK SAMPLING	PREVIOUS CLASS	NATIONAL NORMS	CUT-OFF ON TEST	VOLUNTEER GROUP	OTHER
RANDOM SAMPLING									
BLOCK SAMPLING									
CUT-OFF ON TEST									
VOLUNTEER GROUP									
POPULATION (TOTAL GROUP)									
OTHER									

Shaded areas represent unacceptable sampling designs, and partly shaded areas, those that might be acceptable depending upon specific provisions. White areas are acceptable. For example, use of the complete available student population (e.g., all grade 4 students in the district) or a random sample of these students could have compared performances against either a blocked matched group, or their own previous performance, or a random sample (as a control group), or previous classes in that grade, or national norms. They could not be compared with performances of students above or below cut-off points on a test, or of volunteers. Volunteers could be compared only with blocked matched groups, or with previous performances.

Comparison group--There had always to be a comparison group, explicit or implicit, or the program was rejected. The comparison group had to be a reasonable "competitor." More or less arbitrary setting of achievement of criteria (as in "criterion referenced tests") is no substitute for a comparison group. This was a frequently used device, but in the absence of additional normative measurement, it was always rejected.

Equally unsatisfactory was the common procedure of setting up a straw man as a comparison group, as for example when the only comparison was posttest with pretest, or when the control group was unduly handicapped by a poor alternative program, or by conditions outside the educational environment. In some cases, sophisticated respondents used covariance analysis in an attempt to compensate for gross inequalities between control and experimental groups. Covariate adjustments are legitimate only where relatively minor discrepancies occurred after reasonable attempts had been made to match the contrast groups. One such rejection involved a case where a full standard deviation separated mean pretest performances of the two groups.

Use of national norms was acceptable as long as some attempt was made to demonstrate that the experimental group was reasonably normal. In fact, this is the only device open to a large number of district-wide programs, and unfortunately several were unable to provide the additional demonstration needed, and through no fault of theirs.

Data collection-- There are several ways in which faults in data collection can nullify a demonstration. For example, especially when the treatment period was short (often as little as 4 months), discrepancies between testing dates of experimental and control groups can account for differences in gains. Or when the two groups consisted of only two or three classes each, casual approaches to time limits by even a single teacher could generate apparent differences in performance. For this reason, small samples with this design were regarded with added suspicion.

Units of measurement were not considered as critical. Respondents were free to use raw scores, centiles, standard scores, stanines, or grade equivalents, as long as the usage was consistent and referred to a single source or table.

Control of confounding--This was a prolific source of rejection. The worst of it is that sources of confounding often tend to be correlated with other sources of bias, and therefore cumulative. For example, absenteeism has a low but significant negative correlation with performance, so that missing data tend to be that of poorer performers; and poorer performers can sometimes find anonymity more easily in control groups, than under the spotlight of special programs. Sample attrition is often partly the result of itinerant families, and itinerancy can be both an effect and a cause of

poor home backgrounds. Studies were reported with up to 60% loss of sample between pretests and posttests. Again, with small samples, the confounding effects of individual teaching styles can influence results markedly.

Descriptive statistics--Minimal requirements demanded at least a measure of central tendency (e.g., mean or median) and one of scatter (e.g., standard deviation or interquartile range). When significances of gains were at stake, correlations, covariances, or at least individual differences were necessary. This last involved recalculations of significances. Several projects submitted raw data only, and when possible, AIR staff programmed and produced the needed statistics.

Statistical analyses--Sophisticated analyses were not demanded, although several provided analyses of variance and of covariance. In fact, some of those who did resort to complex analyses could lay claim only to rather minor real gains, and it was found necessary to examine the processing carefully. In doing so, inappropriate or incorrect applications of techniques (even to gross blunders in arithmetic or selection data) were found. In one case, the wrong data had been computed.

Several programs, understandably, sought assistance from outside consultants, but not always to their advantage.

A simple but effective technique, too seldom seen, involved just two-way or contingency tables, with chi-squares or critical ratios of some sort.

Inferential statistics--A crucial requirement was the inclusion of one-tailed significances at, or better than, the 5% alpha level. Tests used could be critical ratios (for samples larger than 100), t-tests, F-tests, chi-squares, or one of the many so-called nonparametric tests, like the Wilcoxon or Mann-Whitney tests. Multiple t-tests were suspect and involved extra work in sorting out claims of effectiveness.

Once in a while, cases were found whose claims were improved after correcting their wrong use of t-tests for uncorrelated means with a single group, though this could occur only where even the wrong test showed significant gains. It is theoretically possible for some programs with real gains to have been rejected because of a failure to use the correct formula.

Educational significance--This was a wise requirement of both Right to Read Program staff and the DRP, and a principle with which

AIR evaluators have always concurred. Mere statistically significant gains are not enough; the gains must also be large enough to justify the effort and cost involved in the program. It is difficult to set a firm criterion here, but the somewhat arbitrary threshold of a gain of one-third of a standard deviation appears meaningful. In practice, over a wide variety of situations involving ratio measurement such as height, or weight, or lengths, one-third of a standard deviation seems to be, if anything, smaller than a just noticeable difference. In the behavioral fields, a shift in the performance of a group of one-third of a standard deviation may seem small, so this can be regarded as a lenient measure, and appears to be a standard adopted by the DRP as well. As further support for this limit, several of the best designed and controlled programs with high PIF composite scores produced gains of this order.

The Dissemination Review Panel (DRP): Fourth Stage Screening

The final approval for the dissemination of the 27 programs recommended for packaging by AIR rested with the Dissemination Review Panel (DRP) of the Office of Education. The DRP sets reasonable standards of sophistication in evaluation for programs approved by it for dissemination. In the case of this project, criteria established related to the same areas of achievement outcomes as those applied throughout the successive screening stages. These were focused upon the contrast of gains for program participants with a non-program comparison group, statistical and educational signficance, generalizability of the findings, and adequate size. In short, the main objective of the DRP is to evaluate all evidence regarding each program and to decide whether the totality of data indicates that the effect of the program is related to the program processes and cannot be equally justified by rival hypotheses. The basic question is quite simply for each review: Is this a program producing improved cognitive gains, that is worthy of endorsement by the federal government for replication by others?

Statistics in relation to the DRP decisions. Table 14 identifies the 27 programs recommended for packaging by AIR, and the results of their review by DRP. Of the 27 programs recommended by AIR, DRP approved 14 and action is pending on 2. Two of these were later rejected by Right to Read because they were not quite suitable for packaging, as they had already received considerable and wide publicity.

TABLE 14

Programs Recommended for Packaging by AIR (N=27)
and Results of DRP Review

Program Title	Location	DRP Decision
All Day Kindergarten	Cincinnati, Ohio	APPROVED for dissemination
Alphaphonics	South San Francisco, California	APPROVED for dissemination
Andover's Individualized Reading System	Andover, Massachusetts	APPROVED for dissemination
Basal Reading Program	Dallas, Texas	Not approved
Child-Parent Centers	Chicago, Illinois	APPROVED for dissemination
Cytanovich Reading Program	Palo Alto, California	Decision pending
Electric Company	Fresno, California	APPROVED for dissemination
Functional LITeracy Program	Fort Ord, California	APPROVED for dissemination
Graphics Expression Reading Improvement System	Uniondale, New York	Not approved
Hawaii English Program	State of Hawaii	APPROVED for dissemination
Higher Horizons 100	Hartford, Connecticut	APPROVED for dissemination
Intensive Reading Improvement Program	Chicago, Illinois	APPROVED for dissemination
Laney College Right to Read Program	Oakland, California	Not approved
Learning to Read Through Reading	Sierra Conservation Center California	APPROVED for dissemination
Learning to Read Through the Arts	New York, New York	APPROVED for dissemination
National Affiliation for Literacy Advance	Baton Rouge, Louisiana	Not approved

(Continued)

TABLE 14 (Continued)

Program Title	Location	DRP Decision
Occupational Learning Center	Syracuse, New York	Not approved
Peer Instruction Program	River Rouge, Michigan	Not approved
Project Read	Memphis, Tennessee	Not approved
Project Read	Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania	APPROVED for dissemination
Region One Bilingual Project	Edinburgh, Texas	Not approved
Responsive Environment Program for Spanish American Children (REPSAC)	Clovis, New Mexico	Not approved
Right to Read Program	San Diego, California	APPROVED for dissemination
Scioto Valley Adult Basic Education Program	5 southern Ohio counties	Not approved
Title I Reading Center Program	Broward County, Florida	APPROVED for dissemination
Upper Cumberland Reading Project	Baxter, Tennessee	Not approved
Van Buren Elementary School DISTAR Reading and Language Program	Stockton, California	Decision pending

The mean PIF composite score of those accepted by the DRP was 47.85; for those rejected, it was 42.50. The difference (5.35) was significant at between the 1% and 2% levels (two-tailed), and yielded a biserial correlation coefficient of .28. The standard deviation of the scores for these was 6.1; for the whole group of 728, the figure was 9.0. Thus, the correlation obtained was for a selected sample; after correction for homogeneity it is .67 for the total group. It is pleasing to find this association between PIF composite score and DRP decisions, and it is an indicator of the validity of the PIF composite score.

The most frequent objection raised by the DRP pertained to the nature of the baseline used, or to inadequacies about it. In one case, a school district had had no way of showing that gains were not the result of an influx of pupils of higher ability. In another, the comparison was only with results of an alternative publisher's program. Smallness of samples, or of numbers of independent sources of samples (e.g., classrooms), and smallness of gains with big samples were also naturally suspect.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Right to Read staff, the OE Dissemination Review Panel, and staff of the American Institutes for Research were substantially at one in the perceptions of the aims of the study. These were objectivity and rigor, and defensible standards for admissible evidence. Over the past decade, the ideals of our society, backed by record-breaking economic commitment, produced a ferment of innovation, in which practically any practitioner with a modicum of thrust could put long-held ideals into practice. Too often claims for success were later found to have been backed by inadequate evidence, by faulty logic, and by special pleading. The evidence presented in this report is to a large extent the outcome of a limitation in the expertise of educators.

Most educators are not researchers, and there is no reason why, in general, we should expect them to be. Teaching is a full-time and demanding profession in its own right, with aims and ethics which are often incompatible with the aims and requirements of research. However, from the research viewpoint, the needs for strong inference demand that the alternative to an innovative program must be given a fair opportunity to demonstrate a superiority to the innovation. But for the teacher, no group of pupils can deliberately be put to possible disadvantage, so appearance of control groups is often

fortuitous. Or again, research design must avoid introducing more changes or variables than it can control for. But a good superintendent will allow only lack of funds, staff, or time to limit the number of "changes for the better" he can make. If he knows of a better testing program, he will introduce it at the same time as innovation in teaching. Many more examples could be given, but it all boils down to this:

- Good teaching practice can mean poor research, and vice versa.
- Quite normal educational circumstances can rob a sound innovation of the opportunity to prove itself.
- Even with the best intentions, innovators will more often than not lack the research sophistication to collect vital data, or to plan a conclusive demonstration until it is too late to do so adequately.

Educators must be given research assistance at the time they need it and only in the quantities that they need. Two important changes are called for:

1. Contact between innovator and researcher must be made in time for the latter to influence research design and collection of data before insurmountable obstacles intervene. This would mean that initial contact between innovator and researcher should occur at least 12 to 18 months before the crucial comparisons are to be made. It would involve no sacrifice of authority on the part of the innovator; he would be free, both to make his own suggestions for compromise, or to reject the whole investigation if he feels that it is becoming a handicap to his primary function.

2. Evaluators need to take exigencies into better account. This does not mean lowering the standards of research rigor. If anything, experience has confirmed the wisdom of the criteria set by all three investigating parties in this study. But special provision needs to be made for recognizing a class of innovation which, while setting high standards of control, finds loopholes which it cannot close and therefore ends with an inconclusive demonstration. Perhaps this is what was intended by references to "promising programs" in the Right to Read request for proposal (RFP) for this project. If so, the issue needs clarification and ground rules formulated. Guidelines in this area will be difficult to develop, but the effort has to be made. Without some circumscriptions, and given only an overriding concern that deserving innovations may be ignored, future investigators will be swamped with unprofitable demands on their time. With this

in mind, we make the following more specific recommendations.

Specific recommendations.

- Contact between innovator and researcher should occur well before outcomes are to be assessed. This contact should start with advertising intentions and inviting applications.
- Applications meeting certain minimum requirements would be followed by correspondence and telephone conferences. Respondents would commit themselves only to discussions and planning. They should be free to withdraw at any point, and otherwise to override advice--at the risk, of course, of having their program rejected from consideration in the end.
- A series of modules of instruction should be prepared on selected evaluation topics such as:
  - Benchmarks by which to assess educational progress, e.g., comparison methods
  - Practical guides to methods of sampling, with their uses and limitations
  - Choosing appropriate tests and measurement units
  - Sources of bias in results, and ways of reducing or compensating for them, e.g., missing data
  - Simple but effective statistics to use, with common sense interpretation
  - Common and uncommon pitfalls, with examples and explanations, e.g., regression to the mean
  - Profitable use of consultants, and when to use in-house expertise
  - Modern mechanical and electronic aids to educational demonstration
  - Pleading special cases profitably, e.g., small samples, large expenses, affective criteria, lack of controls
  - Adequate reporting
- Larger organizations and institutions would be free to use their own in-house experts or to employ consultants. But funds should be available, particularly for small institutions, to have two or three visits by those who would be presenting the evidence eventually. These visits would serve both to deal with special local problems and to keep the study as a whole in competitive form.

•• The use of local consultants should be determined. There should be continuous communication between the institution and the reviewers.

•• Lastly, there should be a special class of innovation where normal demonstrations of success are precluded. But special cases should be kept to a minimum, and the reasons for the disability should have been clearly demarcated for 1 year before the final scrutiny. Moreover, there should be strong reasons other than statistical for a presumption of success. These should include arguments under specified headings such as:

- Clear formulations of objectives and rationales for procedures, together with a unifying philosophy
- Clear demonstrations of substantial and sustained effort, such as preparation and use of materials, on-the-job training, community support, and so on
- Clear economies in specified areas, e.g., of time, or of finances, or of personnel, without sacrifice of achievement
- Systematic effort to collect hard data for future comparisons, and to avoid problems in this area in the future
- Satisfactory replicability and exportability
- Early identification of possible sources of confounding, with real provisions for their assessment (For example, it must be possible to eliminate, or at least to assess, the contribution to change of such possible explanations as change in the population, or contribution by individual teachers, or differences in tests used.)
- Prime focus on cognitive, normative change

In summary, if in the end claims are to lack the support of hard data, it should be unavoidable, and recognized at least a year before the final scrutiny. None of the other criteria laid down by Right to Read should be sacrificed. This perhaps will give effect to the spirit behind the Right to Read concerns about "promising programs," without injustice to those programs who had to pass the more stringent controls. It would make it possible to apply more objective guidelines, with better control of the standards of those so selected.

Chapter V

DISSEMINATION PRODUCTS

Two major dissemination products were developed as a result of the search and screening operations. These were (1) a set of packages presenting multi-media descriptions of exemplary reading programs, and (2) a catalog of reading program descriptions. Also, a guiderule that conveniently summarizes 17 items of information for each of the packaged programs was developed.

Packages

The primary criterion for package development was that the only programs packaged be those approved by the Office of Education Dissemination Review Panel (DRP) as demonstrating exemplary status. A program package was developed for each of 12 of the 14 reading programs approved by DRP. Development of each program package required the assembly of information into a framework that described major program elements or components. This information was partly obtained from the PIF, from available program description and evaluation documents, from telephone consultation with program staff, but primarily through a 5-day visit at each reading program site.

Specifications for basic program information. The basic program information specifications for each package are contained in the Inventory of Program Data (IPD) shown in Appendix E. Each item on the IPD focuses on processes and aspects of a program that might be necessary to repeat if it were to be implemented at another site. The format of the IPD provides for indicating, at any point in the data collection process, information that is still needed about the program.

From items on the IPD, outlines were prepared to guide authors of the program handbooks for the packages. The IPD reference column in the right margin of these writing guides indicates how each section is keyed back to the IPD. The purpose of developing outlines and instructions keyed to the IPD was to ensure that authors would prepare program handbooks that were adequately comprehensive for use by potential replicators. The Outline for the Instructional Handbook and the Outline for the Program Management Handbook are also included in Appendix E, following the sample IPD.

Description of package components. Each program package was planned to consist of a filmstrip with audio-cassette script, a handbook describing the program management components, a handbook describing instructional components, and typically, two charts--one a flow chart depicting program process and the other, an objectives-activities-assessment chart. Thus, there were two central target groups for the packaged information: first, educational managers such as superintendents, principals, and reading program directors; second, instructional staff. However, the packaged materials are also adaptable for a wider audience (school boards, parent-community groups, students). Flexibility of use is built into each package component, as summarized below.

• Filmstrip--The filmstrip for each package serves multiple purposes. It is not strictly a simulated site visit, but must, nevertheless, depict major program highlights and essential features. It certainly serves as a quick presentation of the total program, enabling a viewer to focus on the program's central thematic elements and to view classroom activities. Although a filmstrip with audio commentary cannot detail the many specifics and the complexity of any reading program, it can motivate viewers to examine the detailed information summarized in the two handbooks. Furthermore, the filmstrip itself can also succinctly summarize program features for presentation to school and community groups whose endorsement and support is necessary when planning potential implementation.

• Management Handbook--This handbook contains information about how the program was planned, implemented, managed, budgeted, and evaluated. Essential management and staff training techniques are included. Cost data provided by programs are reported, but recognizing that new sites will have different resources available, different salary scales, different administrative structures, different local accounting practices, and different numbers of students to serve, the emphasis is on budget options that may suggest other ways of providing the required resources.

• Instructional Handbook--In the Instructional Handbook, information about program activities is first summarized quite briefly (Program Overview), then expanded upon (Program Activities), and then selectively detailed (Specific Examples of Instructional Procedures). In this way, teachers have options for selecting the level of detail that serves their various purposes

in reading this handbook. If they are scanning several programs or approaches very superficially, they need read only Program Overviews. If they are carefully comparing options, the Program Activities section will thoroughly acquaint them with classroom activities. If they are using the program or some of its components, the chapter on Specific Examples of Instructional Procedures will be a valuable, practical source of selected details of program operation.

• Charts--Most packages contain two charts. A flow chart depicts the program process. The specific nature of the illustrations varies according to program characteristics. For example, a simulated classroom layout showing a sequence of activities for a single child may be appropriate for depicting one program, but a graphical representation of instructional procedures or program structure may be more appropriate or effective for another. The second chart has three columns in which are summarized the program's objectives and the activities and assessment techniques related to each. Together, the two charts present the program in capsule form, and may be useful devices in program orientation workshops or for quick reference.

The Catalog of Reading Programs

A catalog was prepared consisting of 222 one-page descriptions of reading programs. The purpose of the catalog is to present an overview of promising practices throughout the nation in the field of reading instruction. Programs in the catalog are grouped into four general areas: Elementary Programs, Secondary Programs, Adult Programs, and Special Programs. Taken together, the 222 program summaries exhibit an impressive array of approaches for many target groups.

It must be emphasized that the descriptions presented in the catalog do not include programs endorsed as exemplary by the Office of Education. However, in selecting programs, and consistent with practical time limits for the development of the catalog, a single scale was established based upon PIF items to determine candidates for catalog inclusion. Thus, programs whose descriptions appear in the catalog do represent stronger evaluation components.

The selection scale was based upon unit weighting of each of 10 PIF items as follows:

Item 6	Instruction focused upon cognitive improvement
Item 7	Program in existence for at least 1 year
Item 8	Expectancy of at least 2 years' continuation
Item 9	Evaluation reports available since 1968
Item 12	Participant size of 30 or higher
Item 13 or 14	Evidence of success based upon reading tests
Item 20	Up-to-date program description available
Item 28	Per-pupil costs below $500
Item 44	Baseline reading skills measured routinely

More than 90% of the programs in the catalog had PIF composite scores above the mean of 36 points. None of the remainder had scores of less than 33.

Catalog descriptions were confined to a single page and organized according to common headings: Program Size and Target Population; Year Started; Staff; Major Features; Facilities, Materials, Equipment; Cost; and For Further Information. Instructions for preparing catalog descriptions were developed for authors based on the unshaded IPD items (see IPD in Appendix E). All writers were required to adhere to the one-page limit and standard section headings. However, they were allowed to adapt the IPD-based instructions for preparing these summaries to suit program emphasis. This flexibility allowed them to convey to readers each program's unique character. A sample program description from the Catalog of Reading Programs is shown in Appendix F.

Product Review Procedures

All products, when prepared, were reviewed by relevant parties and when necessary, by required agencies.

Filmstrips and scripts for each program were prepared by AIR staff on the basis of site visits and consultations with reading program staff.

Filmstrips were reviewed by a task force composed of National Right to Read Program staff and revised if necessary. Finally, approvals for the filmstrips and audio commentaries were obtained from the Office of Public Affairs of the Office of Education whose representatives viewed all filmstrips prior to final production. Filmstrips were also reviewed by two members of the AIR Advisory Panel, Dorothy Gaither and Ruth Hessenflow.

All printed materials (handbooks and charts) in each program package were forwarded in draft form to reading program staff. Based on feedback from their review, revisions were made. Revised handbooks and charts for several programs were also reviewed by Dorothy Gaither and Ruth Hessenflow. The National Right to Read Program staff was sent copies of the final versions of handbooks prior to production.

Packages Produced

Packages were produced for the 12 programs listed and summarized in Table 15. As a group, the 12 programs exhibit a range of approaches, yet all are directed toward improving reading skills regardless of the age or circumstances of their participants.

TABLE 15

Descriptive Summaries of the 12 Packaged Programs

Program	Summary
All Day Kindergarten Cincinnati, Ohio Grade Level: Kindergarten	The students in this program are disadvantaged, inner-city preschool children who score at or below the 25th percentile on a preschool inventory. Children attend kindergarten for full-day sessions, performing a variety of activities designed to increase their motor, perceptual, and auditory skills and their language and concept development. Weekly field trips provide them with new experiences, and medical and dental services are made available to them. To motivate families to help their children develop, parent participation in the program is encouraged.
Alphaphonics South San Francisco California Grade Level: Kindergarten	This program uses an organized phonics system to increase the reading readiness of one school's kindergarten children, many of whom have bilingual parents. In a careful sequence of activities, the children learn to name, sound, and write one letter at a time. The program includes a number of devices to motivate pupils and catch their interest, including an imaginary character from outer space who provides frequent rewards. When a child is ready, he is encouraged to begin reading stories and books, and he receives special rewards for these achievements.
Andover's Individualized Reading System Andover, Massachusetts Grade Levels: 1-6	This program is designed for Andover's elementary school children, who are from high-income families and who usually perform well in school. It begins with individualized instruction in basic reading skills, where children are pretested and then assigned specific lessons. Skill instruction, for an individual or a small group, is followed by individually paced work on practice sheets, and a posttest. The teacher then checks the posttest and plans the student's next activities. When the student is able, he spends over half his time on individualized reading and free reading, and in discussions with the teacher of what he has read.

(Continued)

TABLE 15 (Continued)

Program	Summary
Child-Parent Centers Chicago, Illinois Ages: 3-9 years	The goal of the program is to reach disadvantaged children when they are 3 years old and to provide them with consistent, unbroken instruction through the third grade. Eleven centers serve a total of over 2,000 inner-city children, each center offering a unique instructional program tailored to its own community. All centers have a basic skills orientation and aim at developing pupils' use of language, but while some use tightly structured linguistic programs, others have chosen approaches which allow more pupil independence. Parents have an integral role in the program, spending 2 days a month at their centers in meetings, in home economics classes, or as staff volunteers.
Functional LITeracy Program Ft. Ord, California Ages: Army recruits 19 years plus	FLIT is a 6-week course designed to upgrade the reading abilities of Army inductees to minimal levels necessary for certain career areas. FLIT literacy training is unusual because it is geared to job proficiency rather than to general educational development. The training strands consist of modular instructional units with end-of-module proficiency tests to enable each man to progress at his own pace. Instructional modules in each career cluster are based on job-related Army technical manuals and materials, and modules are available for careers in communications, clerical and mechanical work, combat, or as a medic or cook.
Hawaii English Program State of Hawaii Grade Levels: K-6	This program, which now operates in all elementary schools in the State of Hawaii, is designed to accommodate all types of learners in the same multi-graded classroom. Reading skills study each day begins with a planning circle, where each student may consider the activities available to him and, with the teacher's help, choose the mode of learning in which he can be most successful. Activities are done in small groups, in pairs, or individually until all the students meet at the end of the period to evaluate their progress. As soon as a student has reached the sixth-grade achievement level in his individual program (which often occurs in 4 years), his program stresses reading widely, discussing what he has read, and learning techniques to increase his reading comprehension.

(Continued)

TABLE 15 (Continued)

Program	Summary
Intensive Reading Improvement Program Chicago, Illinois Grade Levels: K-8	This program aims to improve reading achievement through an intensive effort to educate teachers in the essential theories and methods of teaching developmental reading. Operating in a cross-section of city schools, the program trains one teacher from each participating school to serve as a reading resource teacher. After receiving 60 hours of training, this resource teacher provides 30 hours of in-depth staff development activities to all teachers at his school. A program newsletter describing development in the improved teaching of reading at participating schools is disseminated to all Chicago public schools.
Learning to Read Through Reading Sierra Conservation Center, California Ages: Prison inmates 18 years plus	This program aims to raise prisoners' reading skills to levels needed for performing conservation work at the center, or for obtaining jobs after release or parole. The 7-week training session uses a "reading with symbols" method, which gives a beginning reader visual cues to help him identify the sound of a letter or of a group of letters. An illiterate student is given a tape and chart explaining the symbol system. He first masters consonant sounds and vowel sounds from phonetic spelling lists, and as he proceeds through the course to special reading books, the cueing with symbols is gradually reduced. The symbols enable students to progress rapidly enough that they experience feelings of confidence and success in their reading. Each student enters the program at the level where he needs work, and the content of the program is designed to be of high interest to prisoners.
Learning to Read Through the Arts New York, New York Grade Levels: 4-6	This program serves disadvantaged inner-city children between the ages of 10 and 12 who are poor readers. Three times a week, outside school hours, the children meet at the Guggenheim Museum or at artists' studios to attend workshops in two of 15 art areas, and to work with a reading teacher. Reading is infused into the arts workshops through the creation of class journals and diaries, movie scripts, poetry, and the collection of information about artists' lives and work. Instruction in the reading workshops is tailored to correct children's specific skill deficiencies. Every week a special event related to the arts is planned for the children.

(Continued)

TABLE 15 (Continued)

Program	Summary
Project Read Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania Grade Levels: 1-5	Project Read serves first through fifth graders in four inner-city schools with an individualized reading program, emphasizing the decoding process in the primary grades, and comprehension and interpretation in intermediate grades. The primary-level curriculum is the same for all children, beginning with letter sounds and blending, and progressing to programmed readers. The children progress through the lessons at their own rates. The intermediate-level curriculum uses a reading center stocked with a wide variety of materials. Materials and activities relate to 500 objectives, each of which has a check-in and check-out test and prescriptions for using reading center materials. Diagnostic tests are used to indicate the level at which each child should be working, and therefore the specific objectives on which he should work.
Right to Read San Diego, California Grade Levels: 7-8	The main thrust of this program, which serves the students of an inner-city junior high school, is to train teachers in a diagnostic-prescriptive approach to teaching reading, and to help them use appropriate reading materials in their classrooms. Teacher assistants and some ninth-grade tutors assist teachers in carrying out individual student reading programs, and students whose reading skills are particularly low attend special laboratories or centers where they receive intensive individual attention. Content in English and social studies is individualized to heighten student interest and to ensure that students receive only course materials they are capable of reading.
Title I Reading Center Program Broward County, Florida Grade Levels: 1-6	Students from low-income families who are functioning approximately 2 years below grade level in reading in grades 1-6 come to the main Reading Center or one of the 11 school-based centers for 1 hour of instruction every other day (a total of 5 hours every 2 weeks). Based on the results of staff-developed diagnostic tests, teachers at the centers prescribe an individualized program of learning and reinforcement activities for each child. A child spends part of each hour receiving direct instruction from the teacher in skills development and the remainder of the hour in reinforcement activities under the supervision of an aide. Staff of the Research Department of Broward County Schools work in close cooperation with program managers and instructors to determine the extent to which program objectives are realized, and to identify changes that should be made in the program.

Guiderule

One additional dissemination product was produced which summarizes in a single circular rule 17 items of information for the 12 packaged programs. This guiderule permits one to quickly and conveniently obtain information relating to the following items for each program:

(1) # Students

(2) Program Draws Students From
- Inner City
- Urban Residential
- Suburban
- Small Town or Rural

(3) Program Setting
- Public School
- Private School
- Community
- Correctional Institution
- Other Agency

(4) Age/Grade Level of Students

(5) Materials Cost for Group of 30

(6) Program Duration
- Periods (hours)
- Days/Week
- Semesters
- Years

(7) Time Spent in Grouping Patterns
- Individual
- Small Group
- Large Group

(8) Program Emphasis
- Readiness
- Beginning Reading
- Remedial
- Accelerated
- Teacher Training

(9) Special Resources Required
- Visual Equipment
- Audio Equipment
- Library or Resource Center
- Museum

(10) Major Groups Included
- Black
- Indian
- Oriental
- Spanish-Speaking
- White

(11) Special Parent Roles
- Aides
- Home Teachers
- Advisory Committee

(12) Source of Materials
- Commerical
- District-Developed
- Teacher-Made
- Student-Originated

(13) Hours of Inservice Required For
- Teachers
- Paraprofessionals

(14) Staff Requirements
- Teachers
- Teaching Aides
- Clerical Aides
- Specialists/Consultants
- Evaluators

(15) Tests Used
- Achievement Pre -
- Achievement Post -
- Ability
- Diagnostic
- Criterion-Referenced

(16) Instructional Strategy
- Decoding
- Basal Reader
- Language Experience
- Linguistic/Oral
- Programmed Learning

(17) Number of Sites Where Program is Operating

Diffusion Planning: A Look to the Future

The efforts of this study have produced 12 information packages for validated, exemplary reading programs, and a catalog of over 200 additional program summaries. The information provided by the packages is for use by staff at potential sites in deciding whether or not to copy all or part of a program and in planning and implementing changes that are decided upon. The catalog contains one-page summaries of reading programs that, taken together, provide potential users with many ideas for upgrading their local reading practices and approaches.

Merely producing these materials will not reduce America's reading problem. Nor will the packages or catalog alone cause anything new to happen. These products must be used in conjunction with other elements in a sound field test plan in order to bring about change.

Once the packages are available, the problem is two-fold:

- Disseminating packages to sites that need and want to improve their present practices in reading instruction
- Determining the kind and amount of assistance a site needs in order to use the package to select, adapt, implement, and evaluate the exemplary program or parts of it

An adequate field test plan must provide solutions to both aspects of the problem--dissemination and implementation--if the packages are to have the desired impact on local reading curricula.

Therefore, systematic pilot study planning would need to:

- Identify specifications for sound diffusion
- Design an adequate field test plan according to local site specifications
- Provide needed assistance to potential users

Assumptions underlying diffusion planning. Identifying the specifications for diffusion planning is based on important assumptions. One assumption is that the packages are more likely to promote improved reading instruction and reading achievement if they are part of a delivery system. The delivery system is made up of several components, only one of which is the package material. Other components of the delivery system must provide

for identifying potential users and supplying them with the packages, and bring to these potential users the support services they need to successfully select, adapt, implement, and evaluate the exemplary reading practices or approaches detailed in the packages. Similarly, the catalog is most likely to lead local staff to implement suitable modifications in their reading programs if it is part of a delivery system that prompts potential users to do this.

A second assumption underlying diffusion planning is the package concept. This concept grew out of the criteria established cooperatively by Right to Read and AIR for identifying exemplary reading programs. The package concept is important because it also reflects Right to Read's broad goals for the study. These goals were to prepare detailed descriptive materials that would faithfully document important features of the exemplary programs--features that could conceivably be crucial for successful implementations at other sites. Consistent with this emphasis, the package concept has these major features.

- Only proven successful programs have been packaged.
- Package materials are faithful to the program as implemented at the successful site.
- Package materials describe processes used at the site objectively and literally so that new sites can copy these successful models.
- Package materials describe essential elements of program operation in different degrees of detail. A filmstrip and wall charts communicate program highlights. Handbooks for teachers and managers provide program overviews and detailed procedures.
- By supplying these levels of detail, potential users have options for selecting the amount of information that serves their various purposes in reading or viewing these materials--e.g., scanning, comparing, or using the program or some of its components.
- Users are viewed as active change agents, not as passive recipients who plug in the package and wait for results. Thus, the package materials do not present descriptions in a tightly prescribed, step-by-step format that might alienate or be ignored by the user.

- To further avoid giving the impression that exact-copy replications are expected at new sites, the handbooks emphasize provisions the program makes for ongoing modifications by teachers and managers. Examples of changes made and their rationale or justification are given to emphasize systematic approaches to adapting the program to changing needs.

Elements of diffusion planning. The assumption underlying product development in this study is that no dissemination materials are teacher- or people-proof. The packages and the detailed information they provide for teachers and managers should be regarded as one component of an adoption plan. To increase the likelihood of successful implementation, they should be used in conjunction with other components of the plan. Diffusion planning consists of several elements:

- Objectives--The broad objective of diffusing information about the exemplary reading programs is to prompt changes in local programs that will result in improvements in reading and reading instruction. Diffusion planning therefore focuses on where this change is to occur, in this case local sites. The focus on local sites means that diffusion planning will have to identify the kinds of local needs, and the means for check-listing them, that potential users must examine while they review the package materials. One element of diffusion planning, then, is to consider the means for encouraging potential users to match options (exemplary programs) to local needs, preferably based on structured self-assessments of the strengths and weaknesses of their existing programs.
- Change agents--Change agents and change plans need to be defined. This includes identifying a delivery system as part of the change-agent network. The main change agents will be those dealing with potential adopters at local sites. Questions to be examined are the one-to-one matching of roles of the change agents with the adopters (managers, teachers), and the role of national, state, and regional agencies in supporting diffusion and implementation. The purpose of this activity will be to define specifications for designing an adequate implementation system.

- Materials--Still another element of diffusion planning is specifying those materials that will be needed to help users select, adapt, implement, and evaluate the exemplary programs, practices, or approaches. The packages are designed to be a critical part of the diffusion system, but they are not spontaneously replicable or adaptable. Other materials to be considered would include newsletters to publicize the packages, convention or conference symposia to explain the search, selection, and packaging rationale, preparation of workshop materials to diffuse change information and strategies through the Right to Read state networks, and needs checklists for use by adopters to identify technical assistance and other needs.

- Context of adoption--Diffusion planning will also consider the context for bringing together the potential users, the delivery system, and the materials discussed above. The definition of context must account for local needs and information about unique student, instructor, and local variables that could obstruct or facilitate changes in existing reading programs. The purpose of this activity will be to set the stage for generating a realistic field test plan--one that can accommodate the environment or constraints in which change must occur.

- Evaluation--Finally, diffusion planning will involve some preplanning for evaluating the effectiveness of the dissemination and implementation strategies and results. It would be expected that these preliminary plans will be modified and expanded when the field test is implemented.

A Field Test Plan

Assumptions underlying a local field test plan. A local field test plan will reflect the following assumptions:

- The packages and the catalog are more likely to promote improved reading instruction and reading achievement if they are part of a delivery system.

- The packages and the catalog are major components of their delivery systems, but other components must bring needed support services to users and prompt them to change local educational policy and practice.

- The delivery system should not compromise the original package concept; the packaged programs are by definition proven successes and should be presented faithfully. However, the field test plan should encourage flexibility on the part of potential users in adapting these programs to local needs.

- The field test plan should recognize that nearly all of the changes made as a result of diffusion will be adaptations.

  The field test plan should recognize that potential users are active change agents and should provide them with a framework they are free to use in order to systematically adapt the exemplary program or portions of it to local needs.

Components of a local field test plan. The components of a local field test plan should include, but not be limited to, the following:

- Change agents. Who are they? At what level do they operate? What are their roles?

- Context of adoption. How will sites be selected? How will key site personnel be identified? What are local variables that may facilitate or block diffusion and/or change?

- Change strategies. How will packages be brought to potential users? What services must be supplied to facilitate selection, adaptation, implementation, and evaluation of the new program or approach? Will there be a need for workshops or other hands-on experiences in which the diffusion team and the user are brought together?

- Packages plus supporting materials. The packages are viewed as a major component in the delivery system. However, other materials will be developed to support the services required by the diffusion implementation system. Materials could conceivably include needs-assessment checklists that will help potential users specify the additional information and assistance they will require to proceed with implementation and evaluation. Training materials for workshops on planning the program implementation and evaluation will also be developed. (See Evaluation below.) Another category of materials will be those designed

to publicize the packages in order to attract potential users.

- Evaluation. This component of the delivery system provides technical assistance new sites need to develop sound evaluation designs. This may require that a special training package on evaluation be developed. The package would be aimed at personnel in typical school districts or other agencies, people who implement programs and must evaluate, but do not have a research expert's expertise in evaluation. The purpose of providing users with help in designing evaluations before they implement programs is to lay the foundation for eventually assessing the success of the program. It is recognized that evaluation of student achievement outcomes will not be appropriate or valid until the shakedown period experienced by newly installed programs has passed.

- Costs. A field test budget covering costs for activating the field test plan will need to be developed. Included will be costs of technical assistance in implementing and monitoring the field test and in evaluating its outcomes. Also included are associated costs for staff and materials.

Early, close coordination with the reading program staff at each of the 12 sites will be necessary in order to develop a sound field test plan. These sites are not necessarily equipped to offer exactly the same implementation support to new sites nor will the same diffusion format always be appropriate in each case. A separate technical report has been prepared which discusses these components in greater detail, based on the practical experience of implementers who have sought to foster successful replications or adaptations of innovative educational programs.

APPENDIX A

Program Nomination Form

Criteria Sheet

Cover Letters:

- Version 1. Program Nomination Panel
- Version 2. State Level Nomination Sources
- Version 3. Large City Superintendents
  Professional Organizations
  Other Groups
- Version 4. Adult/Special Education Contacts

Office of Management and Budget
No. 51 - S73032
Approval Expires 31 December 1973

PROGRAM NOMINATION FORM FOR

OUTSTANDING READING PROGRAMS

* * * * * * * * * PLEASE USE A SEPARATE FORM FOR EACH PROGRAM NOMINATED * * * * * * * * * *

1. Name of Program _____

2. Program Director _____ Title _____

   Address _____ Phone _____

3. If Program Director is unknown to you, please give the name of contact

   Name _____

   Address _____ Phone _____

4. Type of school or organization in which the program operates

   Pre-School _____ EMH _____

   Kindergarten _____ Bilingual _____

   Elementary School _____ Adult Program _____

   High School _____ Other (Describe) _____

   College _____

5. If the program operates in a school, please give the name of the District Superintendent.

   Name _____

   Address _____

6. What evidence, sign, or indication qualified this program as a success in your opinion?

   _____

   _____

7. What are the major features of this program that contribute to its success in your opinion?

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

(over)

8. Are you aware of any documented, published, or unpublished evidence of effectiveness describing the program or its effectiveness? (Please provide complete references if known.)

_____

_____

_____

_____

Nominators's Name _____

Address _____

_____ _____
Phone

Date _____

RETURN TO:

Right to Read Project
American Institutes for Research
P. O. Box 1113
Palo Alto, Calif. 94302

American Institutes for Research
Palo Alto, California
Right to Read Project

CRITERIA FOR SELECTION OF OUTSTANDING READING PROGRAMS

Population

Participants may represent any grade level from preschool through senior high school, adult and community programs, and participants from programs for special target populations, e.g., prison inmates, Head Start children, handicapped students, adult illiterates, etc.

Size

The program, in the case of a school district not concerned with special target populations, must be used throughout the school building with all children at a given grade level or cluster of grades.

Innovativeness

The program may include practices recognized as new, creative, or unusual as well as traditional practices which are producing exceptional results.

Exportability

The various instructional materials, activities, services, organizational details, and key procedural information are amenable to wide-scale dissemination.

Location

The program operates within the United States, its possessions or territories, or dependent schools.

Longevity

The exemplary practice or program has been in operation for at least one year, and there is no reason to expect that it will not continue for another two years (through 1974-75).

Evidence

Achievement in reading-related skills has been substantially improved as a result of the program.

Recency - Recent evaluation data are available (since 1 January 1968).

Availability - Descriptive and evaluative reports are available.

Completeness - Sufficient information is available to evaluate the program.

VERSION 1. Program Nomination Panel

AIR AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH

P.O. Box 1113 • Palo Alto, California 94302 • (415) 493-3550 • Cable: AIRESEARCH

The National Right to Read Program of the U. S. Office of Education has selected the American Institutes for Research to identify up to 25 outstandingly effective reading programs that are now in use in American schools and other institutions and to publicize these programs to other school systems and institutions that may wish to adopt them.

You have been selected as a person knowledgeable about innovative and exceptionally successful reading programs. We hope that you will be willing to participate in this study by nominating one or more reading programs that you know to be successful as candidates for inclusion in the group to be publicized and "packaged" for distribution. We are specially concerned about the process which will create a setting for successful output from this project. "Packaging" in the sense we are using it is more broadly conceived than is generally interpreted. The "packages" from this study will stress the total comprehensive planning activity necessary to successfully duplicate the program elsewhere, but will not include the specific instructional materials used by students and teachers in the classroom. Accordingly, I am enclosing several Program Nomination Forms. If you should need additional copies of the form, I shall be glad to send them.

The program or programs that you nominate may operate at any level from preschool through adulthood. A program, for our purposes, is defined, in the case of a school district, as one which is used throughout the school building at a given grade level, in a cluster of grades, or for a special population (such as a program that is being implemented throughout the primary grades or in all eighth grades or for all deaf children). An effort leveled at only one fifth-grade class where there are other fifth-grade classes would not qualify as a program. Neither would the efforts of a single teacher who is "very successful in teaching reading" qualify as a program. Very large units, such as programs being implemented statewide, are of interest to us and may be nominated for consideration. A program, like a package, is conceived of in a global

sense and includes all those things necessary to implement it successfully. They may be aimed at special subgroups at any of these age levels. We are interested in programs funded by local tax sources and private sources, e.g., business, industry, foundations, etc., as well as those specially funded by states and the federal government.

A list of criteria for selection of outstanding reading programs is enclosed. If you think a program might meet these criteria but are not sure, please nominate it anyway. If you would like to nominate a program which does not yet have statistical evidence of success, do so. In either case, please give particularly careful thought to your answer to Items 6 and 7 on the Program Nomination Form. Both items are designed to identify reasonable, verifiable proofs of success for nominated programs. Evidence may include--but need not be limited to--statistical, "hard" evaluation data; however, such evidence must be clearly defined.

Since we are working on a very tight time schedule, we would appreciate a response from you at your earliest convenience. In order for us to make the appropriate contacts with the schools you nominate, we must receive word prior to November , sooner if possible.

Cordially yours,

John E. Bowers

John E. Bowers
Project Director

AIR AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH

P.O. Box 1113 • Palo Alto, California 94302 • (415) 493-3550 • Cable: AIRESEARCH

The National Right to Read Program of the U. S. Office of Education has selected the American Institutes for Research to identify up to 25 outstandingly effective reading programs that are now in use in American schools and other institutions and to publicize these programs to other school systems and institutions that may wish to adopt them.

You have been selected as a person knowledgeable about innovative and exceptionally successful reading programs. We hope that you and your staff will be willing to participate in this study by nominating one or more reading programs that you know to be successful as candidates for inclusion in the group to be publicized and "packaged" for distribution. We are specially concerned about the process which will create a setting for successful output from this project. "Packaging" in the sense we are using it is more broadly conceived than is generally interpreted. The "packages" from this study will stress the total comprehensive planning activity necessary to successfully duplicate the program elsewhere, but will not include the specific instructional materials used by students and teachers in the classroom. Accordingly, I am enclosing several Program Nomination Forms. If you should need additional copies of the form, I shall be glad to send them.

The program or programs that you nominate may operate at any level from preschool through adulthood. A program, for our purposes, is defined, in the case of a school district, as one which is used throughout the school building at a given grade level, in a cluster of grades, or for a special population (such as a program that is being implemented throughout the primary grades or in all eighth grades or for all deaf children). An effort leveled at only one fifth-grade class where there are other fifth-grade classes would not qualify as a program. Neither would the efforts of a single teacher who is "very successful in teaching reading" qualify as a program. Very large units, such as programs being implemented statewide, are of interest to us and may be nominated for consideration. A program, like a package, is conceived of in a global

sense and includes all those things necessary to implement it successfully. They may be aimed at special subgroups at any of these age levels. We are interested in programs funded by local tax sources and private sources, e.g., business, industry, foundations, etc., as well as those funded by states and the federal government.

A list of criteria for selection of outstanding reading programs is enclosed. If you think a program might meet these criteria but are not sure, please nominate it anyway. If you would like to nominate a program which does not yet have statistical evidence of success, do so. In either case, please give particularly careful thought to your answer to Items 6 and 7 on the Program Nomination Form. Both items are designed to identify reasonable, verifiable proofs of success for nominated programs. Evidence may include--but need not be limited to--statistical, "hard" evaluation data; however, such evidence must be clearly defined.

We are particularly interested in knowing if you have statewide test data which may help in the identification of schools that have outstanding programs.

Since we are working on a very tight time schedule, we would appreciate a response from you at your earliest convenience.

Cordially yours,

John E. Bowers
Project Director

VERSION 3. Large-City Superintendents
Professional Organizations
Other Groups

AIR AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH

P.O. Box 1113 • Palo Alto, California 94302 • (415) 493-3550 • Cable: AIRESEARCH

The National Right to Read Program of the U. S. Office of Education has selected the American Institutes for Research to identify up to 25 outstandingly effective reading programs that are now in use in American schools and other institutions and to publicize these programs to other school systems and institutions that may wish to adopt them.

You have been selected as a person knowledgeable about innovative and exceptionally successful reading programs. We hope that you and your staff will be willing to participate in this study by nominating one or more reading programs that you know to be successful as candidates for inclusion in the group to be publicized and "packaged" for distribution. We are specially concerned about the process which will create a setting for successful output from this project. "Packaging" in the sense we are using it is more broadly conceived than is generally interpreted. The "packages" from this study will stress the total comprehensive planning activity necessary to successfully duplicate the program elsewhere, but will not include the specific instructional materials used by students and teachers in the classroom. Accordingly, I am enclosing several Program Nomination Forms. If you should need additional copies of the form, I shall be glad to send them.

The program or programs that you nominate may operate at any level from preschool through adulthood. A program, for our purposes, is defined, in the case of a school district, as one which is used throughout the school building at a given grade level, in a cluster of grades, or for a special population (such as a program that is being implemented throughout the primary grades or in all eighth grades or for all deaf children). An effort leveled at only one fifth-grade class where there are other fifth-grade classes would not qualify as a program. Neither would the efforts of a single teacher who is "very successful in teaching reading" qualify as a program. Very large units, such as programs being implemented statewide, are of interest to us and may be nominated for consideration. A program, like a package, is conceived of in a global

sense and includes all those things necessary to implement it successfully. They may be aimed at special subgroups at any of these age levels. We are interested in programs funded by local tax sources and private sources, e.g., business, industry, foundations, etc., as well as those funded by states and the federal government.

A list of criteria for selection of outstanding reading programs is enclosed. If you think a program might meet these criteria but are not sure, please nominate it anyway. If you would like to nominate a program which does not yet have statistical evidence of success, do so. In either case, please give particularly careful thought to your answer to Items 6 and 7 on the Program Nomination Form. Both items are designed to identify reasonable, verifiable proofs of success for nominated programs. Evidence may include--but need not be limited to--statistical, "hard" evaluation data; however, such evidence must be clearly defined.

Since we are working on a very tight time schedule, we would appreciate a response from you at your earliest convenience.

Cordially yours,

John E. Bowers

John E. Bowers
Project Director

AIR AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH

P.O. Box 1113 • Palo Alto, California 94302 • (415) 493-3550 • Cable: AIRESEARCH

The National Right to Read Program of the U. S. Office of Education has selected the American Institutes for Research to identify up to 25 outstandingly effective reading programs that are now in use in American schools and other institutions and to publicize these programs to other school systems and institutions that may wish to adopt them.

You have been selected as a person knowledgeable about innovative and exceptionally successful reading programs. We hope that you and your staff will be willing to participate in this study by nominating one or more reading programs that you know to be successful as candidates for inclusion in the group to be publicized and "packaged" for distribution. We are specially concerned about the process which will create a setting for successful output from this project. "Packaging" in the sense we are using it is more broadly conceived than is generally interpreted. The "packages" from this study will stress the total comprehensive planning activity necessary to successfully duplicate the program elsewhere, but will not include the specific instructional materials used by students and teachers in the classroom. Accordingly, I am enclosing some Program Nomination Forms. If you should need additional copies of the form, I shall be glad to send them.

A program or programs that you nominate may operate at any level from preschool through adulthood. We expect to receive hundreds of nominations for state and federally funded school-based programs. We have contacted you because we also want nominations for programs which serve special subgroups of the population. Specifically, we are seeking reading programs for adults, including those for teenagers who have dropped out of school, and reading programs for children in special education classes. We hope you will consider as nominees programs which may be funded by local tax sources and private sources, e.g., business, industry, foundations, etc., as well as those funded by states and the federal government.

 An Equal Opportunity Employer

A list of criteria for selection of outstanding reading programs is enclosed. If you think a program might meet these criteria but are not sure, please nominate it anyway. If you would like to nominate a program which does not yet have statistical evidence of success, do so. In either case, please give particularly careful thought to your answer to Items 6 and 7 on the Program Nomination Form. Both items are designed to identify reasonable, verifiable proofs of success for nominated programs. Evidence may include--but need not be limited to--statistical, "hard" evaluation data; however, such evidence must be clearly defined.

Since we are working on a very tight time schedule, we would appreciate a response from you at your earliest convenience.

Cordially yours,

John E. Bowers
Project Director

APPENDIX B

Program Nomination Panel

PROGRAM NOMINATION PANEL

Dr. Leon Williamson
Dr. Mavis Martin
Nancy B. Davis
Sister Beverly Bell
William Durr
Merri Warren
John Manning
Clarice Millam
Thomas C. Hatcher
Vernice Hubbard
H. Alan Robinson
David Yarington
Egon Guba
Irene J. Athey
Marie Hackett
Edward B. Fry
Dolores Durkin
John Follman
Morton Botel
Helen Huus
Marjory S. Johnson
Jerry Walker
Roy Butz
Laura Zirbes
Constance M. McCullough
William Sheldon
Theodore L. Harris
Robert Bradfield
Mrs. Charlotte Brooks
Dr. Lilyan Hanchey
Bonnie McCullough
Joseph Fisher
Dr. Eric Thurston
Louella Burmeister

Dr. Wesley Mieirhenry
Dr. Asa Hillard
Terrell Bell
Dr. Ester J. Swenson
Russell Jackson
Albert Harris
Helen Kyle
Fred Strodtbeck
Doris Entwistle
Fredelle Maynard
Edward L. Palmer
Gerald S. Lesser
Alton Raygor
Harry Singer
Edmund Gordon
Albert N. Hieronymus
Warren Finley
Rev. C. Albert Koob
Milagros Aquino
Meyer Weinberg
Alonzo Perales
Nancy St. John
Richard I. Miller
Leon M. Lessinger
Wilbur J. Cohen
Boyd McCandless
Leon Hall
Roland Nagle
Robert Hess
Edward C. Pino
Grayce A. Ransom
Anne McKillop
Barbara Bateman
William Cruickshank

Richard L. Carner
Dr. Harvey Goldman
Walt Wolfram
Lila Gleitman
K.S. Goodman
Albert J. Kingston
Eleanor J. Gibson
Jack W. Lombard
Mrs. June Durand
Richard L. Smith
Dr. Thomas Fitzgibbon
Dr. Samuel Messick
Scholastic Test Service
Teachers College Press
Lyons, Carnahan, Inc.
Mary McNulty
Hon. Alonza Bell
Hon. John Dellenback
Hon. Edwin D. Eshleman
Sen. Peter H. Dominick
Sen. Jacob K. Javits
Sen. Richard S. Schweiker
Hon. Carl D. Perkins
Hon. Elliott Hagan
Hon. Daniel J. Flood
Hon. Edith Green
Hon. John Brademas
Sen. Warren G. Magnuson
Sen. Claiborne Pell

APPENDIX C

Professional Organizations and Other Groups

PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND OTHER GROUPS*

Adult Education Association of the U.S.A.
Adult Education Regional Programs*
American Association of Mental Deficiency
American Association of Publishers (and other publishers/companies)
American Association of School Administrators
American Federation of Teachers
American Library Association
American Speech and Hearing Association
ASCD Urban Curriculum Leaders*
Association for Childhood Education International (now called Cooperative Development Program)
Association for Children with Learning Disabilities
Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
Association of Black Psychologists
Association of University Evening Colleges
Council for Basic Education
Council for Exceptional Children
Deans of Continuing Education*
Institute of the Black World
International Reading Association
Joseph P. Kennedy Foundation
Junior College Organizations*
Literacy Volunteers of America
National Affiliation for Literacy Advance
National Association for Public Continuing and Adult Education
National Association for Retarded Children
National Association of Black Students
National Association of Elementary School Principals
National Council of State Education Associations
National Council of Teachers of English
National School Boards Association
National Society for Autistic Children
National University Extension Association
Negro Bibliographic Research Center

Regional Right to Read Representatives*

Special Education Personnel ir State Education Agencies*

State Administrators for Junior Colleges*

State Association of School Administrators

United Cerebral Palsy Association

*Many of these groups were contacted as part of AIR's intensified search for adult programs, special education programs, and programs operating in the community rather than in school settings.

APPENDIX D

Program Information Form

Cover Letters:

Version 1. School Programs
Version 2. Superintendents of Schools
Version 3. Non-school Programs

Office of Management and Budget
No. 51 - S73039
Approval Expires 30 June 1974

AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH

Center for Research and Evaluation
in the Applications of Technology in Education

PROGRAM INFORMATION FORM

Identifying, Validating and Multi-Media Packaging of Successful Reading Programs

A Project sponsored by
The National Right to Read Program
U.S. Office of Education

IMPORTANT NOTICE

Please answer each item carefully and completely before you return this form. The information you provide will be used for evaluating your program for further consideration in this study.

I•R ◇ CREATE P.O. BOX 1113 PALO ALTO, CALIFORNIA 94302 (LOCATION 1791 ARASTRADERO ROAD) [] TEL (415) 493-3550
CABLE ADDRESS AIRESEARCH/PALO ALTO

PROGRAM INFORMATION FORM

SECTION I -- Identification Information

Program Title _____ (1)

Program Director _____ Title _____ (2)

Address _____ Phone _____

Sponsor (school district or other) _____ (3)

Superintendent or director _____

Address _____ Phone _____

Address where your program is operating

_____ (4)

_____

_____

If you know any, please list one or two other school districts or sponsoring institutions where the total program named in Item 1 is being duplicated. (5)

Educational Facility	Address and Zip Code
_____	_____
_____	_____

SECTION II -- Program Screening Information

In this section, all questions are numbered at the right-hand edge; please answer each by marking the letter X in the appropriate box.

Is cognitive improvement in reading and reading-related skills a major focus of your program?		YES ☐	NO ☐ **	(6)
How long has your program been operating continuously?	Less than a year		☐	(7)
	At least a year but less than two years		☐	
	Two years but less than three		☐	
	Three years or more		☐	
	None of these (If none, indicate why) _____		☐	
Do you plan to keep your program operating for at least two more years (through the 1974-75 academic year)?	(If no, indicate why not) _____	YES ☐	NO ☐	(8)
Are evaluation reports (e.g., baseline test data, re-test data, measures of the program's effect) available?	None available and none planned		☐ **	(9)
	None available but initial steps taken		☐	
	Available but not published		☐	
	Most recent publication prior to 1/1/68		☐	
	Most recent publication since 1/1/68		☐	
Evaluation data are available for how long?	Three years or more		☐	(10)
	More than two years, less than three		☐	
	More than one year, less than two		☐	
	Only one year		☐	
	Less than one year		☐	
	Not available		☐ **	

Are the data evaluating your total program approach available for one or more sites?

- More than one site (e.g., more than one school) ☐ (11)
- Your site only ☐
- Not available ☐

How many participants or individual records are included in the evaluation?

- Less than 10 ☐ ** (12)
- 10 to 29 ☐
- 30 to 49 ☐
- 50 to 99 ☐
- 100 to 199 ☐
- 200 to 499 ☐
- 500 or more ☐

** If you marked any one of these boxes, do not complete this form or send program documents. INSTEAD, please detach the first 3 pages and return them so that your response can be recorded.

What measures have been analyzed to show the success of your program?

	YES	NO	
Analysis of nationally standardized reading test results	☐	☐	(13)
Analysis of locally developed reading test results	☐	☐	(14)
Analysis of nationally standardized general ability measures	☐	☐	(15)
Analysis of locally developed general ability measures	☐	☐	(16)
Analysis of other program success indicators (e.g., observations, affective measures, teacher records, questionnaires)	☐	☐	(17)
Other procedures (Please specify) _____	☐	☐	(18)
Measures not yet analyzed	☐	☐	(19)

Are up-to-date program descriptions available (e.g., staff, participants, schedules and activities)?

	YES	NO	
	☐	☐	(20)

What kind of improvement or gain by program students was found?

	YES	NO	
The mean test score of the students exceeds a specified norm	☐	☐	(21)
A mean gain over exactly one year is bigger than expected	☐	☐	(22)
A mean gain for less than one year is bigger than expected	☐	☐	(23)
The mean of students in the program exceeds that of comparable students not in the program	☐	☐	(24)
The mean gain of students in the program is greater than for comparable students not in the program	☐	☐	(25)
Some other improvement, not one of these (Please specify) _____	☐	☐	(26)

How significant were the statistical results showing the effect of your program?

No tests of significance were made	☐ (27)
No significant differences found yet	☐
The program showed differences significant between the 5 and 10 percent one-tailed (10 to 20 two-tailed) level	☐
The program showed differences significant at better than the 5 percent one-tailed (10 per cent two-tailed) level	☐
The program showed differences significant at better than the one percent one-tailed (two per cent two-tailed) level	☐

By what amount does the annual per-pupil cost of this program exceed that of the regular district program?

Less than $50	☐	(28)
$50 to $99	☐	
$100 to $199	☐	
$200 to $299	☐	
$300 to $399	☐	
$400 to $499	☐	
$500 to $999	☐	
$1000 or more	☐	

For what target population of students is your program designed?

	YES	NO	
Unselected cross section	☐	☐	(29)
Mentally retarded	☐	☐	(30)
Bilingual	☐	☐	(31)
Disadvantaged	☐	☐	(32)
Physically handicapped (deaf, blind, etc.)	☐	☐	(33)
Institutionalized	☐	☐	(34)
Other groups (Please specify below)	☐	☐	(35)

_____

Are 20 percent or more of your program students in any of the following categories?

	YES	NO	
American Eskimo, Aleut, or Indian	☐	☐	(36)
Black	☐	☐	(37)
Oriental or Asian	☐	☐	(38)
Spanish-speaking	☐	☐	(39)
White	☐	☐	(40)
All others	☐	☐	(41)

In which area do the majority of the program students live?

- Rural and small town of less than 10,000 ☐ (42)
- Small city of 10,000-199,000 ☐
- Small city suburbs ☐
- Inner area in large city of 200,000 or more ☐
- Residential area in large city ☐
- Suburbs of a large city ☐

What is the average family income level of students in the program?

- Low income (under $6,000) ☐ (43)
- Middle income ($6,000-$15,000) ☐
- High income (above $15,000) ☐

Are specific diagnostic techniques or instruments used to:

Determine each student's level of reading readiness or skill (e.g., his reading grade level)? (If yes, please specify) YES ☐ NO ☐ (44)

_____

Determine each student's strengths, weaknesses, and difficulties in language and reading skills (e.g., difficulty with decoding)? (If yes, please specify) YES ☐ NO ☐ (45)

_____

In this program, how many hours per week are scheduled for the subject Language Arts?

- Less than 2 hours ☐ (46)
- 2 hours to 3 hours 59 minutes ☐
- 4 hours to 5 hours 59 minutes ☐
- 6 hours to 7 hours 59 minutes ☐
- 8 hours to 9 hours 59 minutes ☐
- 10 hours to 11 hours 59 minutes ☐
- 12 hours or more ☐

What summary statistics were used in the analysis of program data?

	YES	NO	
Means or medians	☐	☐	(47)
Standard deviations or variances	☐	☐	(48)
Covariances or correlation coefficients	☐	☐	(49)
Frequency counts, percentages, or proportions	☐	☐	(50)
Significance tests	☐	☐	(51)
Methods not mentioned above (Please specify) _____	☐	☐	(52)

How large was the estimated program effect on achievement (i.e., the average gain of students in the program over and above the gain expected in a comparison group)? (If more than one estimation, give the higher figure only.)

One-tenth of a standard deviation unit	☐	(53)
One-fifth of a standard deviation unit	☐	
One-quarter of a standard deviation unit	☐	
One-third of a standard deviation unit	☐	
One-half of a standard deviation unit	☐	
Better than a half SD	☐	
Gain cannot be given this way	☐	

Which of these factors were taken into explicit account in the analyses of <u>BOTH</u> program <u>AND</u> comparison data?

	YES	NO	
Age	☐	☐	(54)
Sex	☐	☐	(55)
Grade level	☐	☐	(56)
Ethnic proportions in group	☐	☐	(57)

What was the reliability coefficient of the test used to measure reading achievement for this program?

- ☐ Between .6 and .69
- ☐ Between .7 and .79
- ☐ Between .8 and .89
- ☐ .9 and over
- ☐ Given by publishers for standardization group only as over .8
- ☐ Not yet determined
- ☐ No such test was used

(58)

What percentage of annual attrition or loss of students from the program was allowed for, to correct for bias in statistical analysis (e.g., by eliminating from consideration persons who start the program but do not finish)?

- ☐ Was 15 percent or more
- ☐ Was between 10 and 14.9 percent
- ☐ Was between 5 and 9.9 percent
- ☐ Was between 0 and 4.9 percent
- ☐ No allowance was made for losses
- ☐ No losses occurred

(59)

How similar were the pre- and post-tests used to determine gain in reading skills?

- ☐ Were identical
- ☐ Were parallel forms of a single test
- ☐ Were consecutive forms from the same source
- ☐ Were similar in form, but from different sources
- ☐ Only one test has been applied
- ☐ Tests were not of reading skills
- ☐ No tests were applied

(60)

SECTION III -- Brief Descriptive Information

In what year did the program begin operation? _____ (Year) (61

How many program participants and classes (groups) are there in your program? If this is a school-based program, indicate enrollment by class and grade level. (62

Grade or Other Level	Number of Participants	Number of Classes or Groups

Please list the major instructional strategies used to help clients improve their reading-related skills. Briefly describe, if necessary. (63

Are there any major program features (e.g., parent involvement) which are not included in your list of instructional strategies above and are not included in your list of key program objectives in the chart at the end of this questionnaire? If so, please list up to three (3) of these major program features. Briefly describe, if necessary. (64

Please list up to five (5) kinds of materials and/or equipment which are absolutely indispensable for your program, noting their availability as "commercial," "district," "teacher-prepared," "student-prepared," or other appropriate comment. (65)

Most Essential Items of Materials and/or Equipment	Quantity for 30 Students	Availability

Where are program activities physically located? If any special features were provided to suit these facilities to the program, briefly note. (66)

Location of Program Activities	Special Features

What is the total cost of instructional materials for a class of 30? (67)

$_____ for a class of 30, to the nearest dollar

To the nearest dollar, roughly what portion of the funds currently required to maintain the program come from the following sources? Please specify the exact source for each category, e.g., Title III. (68)

$_____ Federal _____

$_____ State _____

$_____ Local _____

$_____ Private _____

What is the average, annual per-pupil cost for the district's regular school program (i.e., cost per pupil for students outside the special reading program described herein)? (69)

$ _____, per-pupil cost for regular program

What are the staff requirements for your program?

Staff Category	# Req'd. for Students	Portion of Time	Special Professional Qualifications for Program	Special Role Performed in Program	Program Requires Inservice Training? If so:	
					In What Skills?	For How Many Hours
ADMINISTRATIVE:						
INSTRUCTIONAL: (Certified)						
PARAPROFESSIONAL:						
SUPPORT OR SPECIAL RESOURCE:						
OTHER:						

What are the specific objectives of the program and how are these desired outcomes assessed? (Your responses should read consistently across columns.) (71)

Major objectives of the program (List the key objectives, even if they cannot be adequately tested or were difficult to measure.)	What assessment techniques and instruments were used to measure student achievement of each objective in Column 1? For example: Test--Specify title, level, form, and developer or publisher Observation--Of what? By whom? Teacher report--Of what? Questionnaire--About what? Answered by whom? Etc.	What were the results? How did the target group perform or change?

111

Return to:

John E. Bowers

American Institutes for Research

P. O. Box 1113

Palo Alto, California 94302

We would appreciate it if you would return this form by First Class mail. Documents may be sent under separate cover.

AIR AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH

P.O. Box 1113 • Palo Alto, California 94302 • (415) 493-3550 • Cable: AIRESEARCH

The National Right to Read Program of the U. S. Office of Education has selected the American Institutes for Research to identify up to 25 outstandingly effective reading programs that are now in use in American schools and other institutions and to publicize these programs to other school systems and institutions that may wish to adopt them.

Your district has been nominated as one which may qualify as having a reading program among the best in the nation. We hope you will be willing to provide information on your program so that we may consider it along with other nominees.

Information about the 25 programs selected for special publicizing will be packaged and made available to describe the exemplary models to other school districts. In addition, many more programs will be described in a nationally disseminated catalog of reading programs. If your program is selected, full credit and acknowledgment will be given to you and your district in the catalog or package. Packaging in the sense we are using it is more broadly conceived than is generally the case. The packages produced in this study will stress the plans and activities necessary to duplicate the program successfully, and not just the specific instructional materials used by students and teachers in the classroom. Similarly, a program will constitute the total set of conditions we wish to identify and package.

As is implied by these broad definitions, part of our task is to collect detailed information on programs being considered for this study. For the purpose of collecting initial information about your program, we have enclosed a Program Information Form. We have also enclosed a list criteria so that you may judge whether your program qualifies as a candidate for our study. If you feel your program meets these criteria, we ask your cooperation in carefully and accurately completing this form. We realize that the form is long and will require some expenditure of effort on your

part. However, the potential payoff for you and your district is also considerable if your program should be selected.

Many of the items on the Program Information Form deal with statistical and evaluative techniques which may not have been used in your program. Please do not conclude that your program must meet overly severe standards of evaluation rigor in order to qualify for this study. We realize the practical limits within which real programs must operate. We will therefore be cataloging and packaging a wide range of reading programs. If you feel that your program has special merit, we encourage you to complete the form. All programs returning completed forms will receive careful consideration for cataloging and packaging.

We wish to base our evaluation of your program on as much information as possible. While the Program Information Form does give us a good starting point, we also wish to examine whatever written documents you have describing your program. We are especially interested in seeing the results of any evaluation you have made. For this reason, we ask that you send us as complete a set of written documents as possible when you return the Program Information Form.

In addition to programs in schools, we are interested in finding outstanding programs which may be functioning in or near your community through other agencies. If you know of any such programs, we would appreciate knowing about them and whom to contact. A Program Nomination Form is enclosed for this purpose.

There is some urgency in receiving a prompt reply from you since we are scheduled to begin packaging at an early date. In order for a program to be considered, the Program Information Form together with all printed reports about your program must be received by us no later than 15 February or sooner if possible.

Should you have questions, please call me or Mrs. Peggie Campeau at (415) 493-3550 or at (408) 354-9088.

Sincerely,

John E. Bowers
Project Director

P. S. As you complete the Program Information Form, please note that in a YES/NO item, either YES or NO should be marked for every pair of boxes in the numbered response column.

VERSION 2. Superintendents of Schools

AIR AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH

P.O. Box 1113 • Palo Alto, California 94302 • (415) 493-3550 • Cable: AIRESEARCH

The National Right to Read Program of the U. S. Office of Education has selected the American Institutes for Research to identify up to 25 outstandingly effective reading programs now in use in American schools and other institutions. In-depth information packages on the programs selected will be made available to other educators as exemplary models with full credit and acknowledgement to program staff and school district.

In your district an outstanding reading program has been nominated which may qualify for our study. Our time schedule requires very rapid identification of those exemplary programs for which we will be compiling information packages. Therefore, we have taken the liberty of contacting the staff of the above program. They should receive a letter and a questionnaire, the "Program Information Form," about the same time this letter reaches you. We would of course be most grateful for any action you or your staff may wish to take that will expedite the return of the information we need.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

John E. Bowers
Project Director

VERSION 3. Non-school Program

AIR AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH

P.O. Box 1113 • Palo Alto, California 94302 • (415) 493-3550 • Cable: AIRESEARCH

The National Right to Read Program of the U. S. Office of Education has selected the American Institutes for Research to identify up to 25 outstandingly effective reading programs that are now in use in American schools and other institutions and to publicize these programs to other school systems and institutions that may wish to adopt them.

Your agency/institution has been nominated as one which may qualify as having a reading program among the best in the nation. We hope you will be willing to provide information on your program so that we may consider it along with other nominees.

Information about the 25 programs selected for special publicizing will be packaged and made available to describe the exemplary models to other agencies/institutions. In addition, many more programs will be described in a nationally disseminated catalog of reading programs. If your program is selected, full credit and acknowledgment will be given to you and your agency/institution in the catalog or package. Packaging in the sense we are using it is more broadly conceived than is generally the case. The packages produced in this study will stress the plans and activities necessary to duplicate the program successfully, and not just the specific instructional materials used by students and teachers in the classroom. Similarly, a program will constitute the total set of conditions we wish to identify and package.

As is implied by these broad definitions, part of our task is to collect detailed information on programs being considered for this study. For the purpose of collecting initial information about your program, we have enclosed a Program Information Form. We have also enclosed a list of criteria so that you may judge whether your program qualifies as a candidate for our study. If you feel your program meets these criteria, we ask your cooperation in carefully and accurately completing this form. We realize that the form is long and will require some expenditure of

effort on your part. However, the potential payoff for you and your agency/institution is also considerable if your program should be selected.

Many of the items on the Program Information Form deal with statistical and evaluative techniques which may not have been used in your program. Please do not conclude that your program must meet overly severe standards of evaluation rigor in order to qualify for this study. We realize the practical limits within which real programs must operate. We will therefore be cataloging and packaging a wide range of reading programs. If you feel that your program has special merit, we encourage you to complete the form. All programs returning completed forms will receive careful consideration for cataloging and packaging.

We wish to base our evaluation of your program on as much information as possible. While the Program Information Form does give us a good starting point, we also wish to examine whatever written documents you have describing your program. We are especially interested in seeing the results of any evaluation you have made. For this reason, we ask that you send us as complete a set of written documents as possible when you return the Program Information Form.

We are especially interested in finding other outstanding programs which may be functioning in or near your community through other agencies. If you know of any such programs, we would appreciate knowing about them and whom to contact.

There is some urgency in receiving a prompt reply from you since we are scheduled to begin packaging at an early date. In order for a program to be considered, the Program Information Form together with all printed reports about your program must be received by us no later than sooner if possible.

Should you have questions, please call me or Mrs. Peggie Campeau at (415) 493-3550 or at (408) 354-9088.

Sincerely yours,

John E. Bowers
Project Director

P. S. As you complete the Program Information Form, please note that in a YES/NO item, either YES or NO should be marked for every pair of boxes in the numbered response column.

APPENDIX E

Inventory of Program Data
Outline for the Instructional Handbook
Outline for the Program Management Handbook

PROGRAM CODE NO._____

INVENTORY OF PROGRAM DATA (IPD)

****

VALIDATOR(S): _____

_____

WRITER(S) : _____

_____

SITE VISITORS: _____

_____

AS A RESULT OF OUR IN-HOUSE VALIDATION, THIS PROGRAM IS RECOMMENDED FOR (check one box):

CATALOG only
- HIGH priority----- ☐
- MODERATE priority- ☐

PACKAGE
- HIGH priority-- ☐
- MODERATE priority- ☐

1.00 IDENTIFICATION

XEROX AND AFFIX THAT PORTION OF PAGE 1 OF THE PIF WHICH SUPPLIES THE FOLLOWING IDENTIFICATION INFORMATION:

PIF Item 1: Program Title

PIF Item 2: Program Director's Name, Title, Address, and Phone

PIF Item 3: Sponsor, Superintendent or Other Director's Name, Address, and Phone

PIF Item 4: Address Where Program Operates

PIF Item 5: Other Sites

INVENTORY OF PROGRAM DATA (IPD) PROGRAM CODE NO. _____

Shaded right margin indicates that the question should be ignored for CATALOG programs and answered for PACKAGE programs.

NEED MORE INFO

1.01 For further information:

For CATALOG program, name and address which should appear in the "For Further Information" section (Note below.) ☐

For PACKAGE program, name and address of person who coordinates visits (Note below.) ☐

Complete the information below for each person contacted in the course of program validation or preparation of the PDF or INFOPAK.

Name and Title	Address	Phone	Why Contact?
			Person who filled out PIF
			Person who should appear in the "for further Info" section.
			Person who arranges visits.

1.02 Program documentation: (Also list AV documentation, if any, and its cost and availability.)

Document Number	Bibliographic Reference
PIF	(Program Information Form)
1	(Notes from phone contacts, document review, site visits.)
2 (etc.)	

	DOC. NO See key, IPD p. 3	PAGE OR REF.	NEED MORE INFO
2.00 PARTICIPANTS			
2.01 Age/grade and special characteristics on PIF agree with documents	PIF	29-35, 62	☐
2.02 Selection procedures (diagnostic tests, parent request, admission panel, referral system, etc.)			☐
2.03 Selection criteria (qualifications, background, skills, etc.)			☐
3.00 PROGRAM SIZE			
3.01 Program enrollment data on PIF agree with documents	PIF	62	☐
4.00 OBJECTIVES			
4.01 Key objectives on PIF agree with documents	PIF	63,64 71	☐

	DOC. NO See key, IPD p. 3	PAGE OR REF.	NEED MORE INFO
5.00 LOCALE (DEMOGRAPHY)			
5.01 Demographic background of participants on PIF agrees with documents	PIF	36-43	☐
5.02 Population characteristics of locale which affect program:			
Transiency			☐
Second language or strong dialect influence			☐
Other			☐
5.03 (Question for PACKAGE program operating IN SCHOOL:) Characteristics of school district which affect program:			
Size			☐
District policies			☐

INVENTORY OF PROGRAM DATA (IPD) PROGRAM CODE NO._____

	DOC. NO. See key, IPD p. 3	PAGE OR REF.	NEED MORE INFO
6.00 PROGRAM HISTORY			
6.01 PIF and documents agree with respect to year program started	PIF 61		☐
6.02 Initial stimulus for program:			
Effort of key person (get contact info)			☐
Outgrowth of earlier effort (Any modifications?)			☐
Other			☐
6.03 Needs assessment done? If YES:			
By whom			☐
Methods/instruments			☐
Specific needs identified			☐
Needs selected for program (priorities)			☐
Who makes these decisions?			☐
Useful materials for package (e.g., questionnaires)			☐

PROGRAM CODE NO._____

	DOC. NO. See key, IPD p. 3	PAGE OR REF.	NEED MORE INFO
6.04 Planning process (before program began): Major steps			☐
Key persons/roles in major planning tasks			☐
Useful materials for package (e.g., flow charts)			☐
6.05 Implementation process: Major steps			☐
Key persons/roles in major implementation tasks			☐
Effective/Ineffective procedures			☐
Useful materials for package (e.g., schedules)			☐
6.06 If program has changed from original plan: How? (changes in goals, activities, staff, etc.)			☐
Why? (recruitment problems, community pressure, budget cuts)			☐
6.07 Program's growth since it began			☐

INVENTORY OF PROGRAM DATA (IPD) PROGRAM CODE NO. _____

	DOC. NO. See key, IPD p. 3	PAGE OR REF.	NEED MORE INFO
7.00 STAFF REQUIREMENTS			
7.01 Staff requirements on PIF agree with documents (highlight essential qualifications; double-check for consultants and volunteers)	PIF	70	☐
7.02 Inservice training (additional details):			
Specific objectives			☐
Key persons/roles in planning/conducting			☐
When and where (get schedule)			☐
Instructional methods/activities			☐
Assessment of staff proficiency in skills taught			☐
7.03 Problems in recruiting or maintaining staff:			
Incentives to attract staff			☐
Teachers allowed to leave program			☐
Other			☐

PROGRAM CODE NO. _____

	DOC. NO See key, IPD p. 3	PAGE OR REF.	NEED MORE INFO
8.00 PROGRAM MANAGEMENT			
8.01 Chain of command: Protocol for who tells whom what (get organization chart)			☐
Day-to-day situations in which above routine is modified to facilitate program management			☐
Procedures for decision-making re unsolicited advice from teachers, students, and parents			☐
8.02 Periodic review of program (process evaluation): Program procedures assessed			☐
Who does what? (key persons/roles)			☐
Method/instruments used			☐
Measurement schedule/frequency (get schedule of checkpoints/other records)			☐
Major decisions made on basis of review			☐
Who makes these decisions			☐
8.03 Opinions re most essential management techniques for replicating program (Indicate identity of person expressing opinion)			☐

INVENTORY OF PROGRAM DATA (IPD)

PROGRAM CODE NO. _____

	DOC. NO See key, IPD p. 3	PAGE OR REF.	NEED MORE INFO
9.00 THE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM			
9.01 Strategies and features on PIF agree with documents	PIF	63, 64	☐
9.02 Instructional activities (more detail):			
Teaching techniques (specific examples)			☐
Classroom management/motivation techniques			☐
Feedback techniques			☐
9.03 Grouping patterns used:			
Purpose of each type of grouping			☐
How frequently used			☐
Describe an event for each grouping			☐
9.04 Typical schedule of program activities (Indicate period, day, week, other unit of time covered by schedule; minutes or portion of time per activity; whether schedule rotates.)			☐
Obtain or produce a time line which shows the sequence of program activities for a typical participant from the time he enters the program until he completes the program. Also indicate the range of weeks per activity which might be required due to the range of participants' abilities.			☐

PROGRAM CODE NO. _____

		DOC. NO See key, IPD p. 3	PAGE OR REF.	NEED MORE INFO
9.05	On-going diagnosis and assessment of participants:			
	Specific reading-related skills/problems measured			☐
	Who does what (key persons/roles)			☐
	Method/instruments used to measure each skill/problem (See also PIF 44, 45)			☐
	Measurement schedule/frequency			☐
	Obtain sample copy of individual's diagnostic record or profile			☐
	Decisions based on measurement:			
	Prescribe individualized instructional program			☐
	Group students			☐
	Release from program			☐
	Other			☐
9.06	Special provision for teacher planning (regular meetings to plan each individual's program, etc.?)			☐
9.07	Provision for teachers to modify features of the program			☐

INVENTORY OF PROGRAM DATA PROGRAM CODE NO. _____

	DOC. NO. See key, IPD p. 3	PAGE OR REF.	NEED MORE INFO
9.08 Parent/community involvement:			
Specific nature of involvement			☐
Concrete results			☐
Measures taken to secure their support			☐
10.00 FACILITIES			
10.01 Description of program facilities on PIF agrees with documents	PIF	66	☐
10.02 Special construction/alterations required for program facilities			☐
11.00 EQUIPMENT AND MATERIALS			
11.01 Equipment and materials data on PIF agree with documents	PIF	65	☐
11.02 Purpose/procedures for use of each key item (Relate to specific instructional events/ objectives.)			☐

	DOC. NO. See key, IPD p. 3	PAGE OR REF.	NEED MORE INFO
12.00 COST			
12.01 Materials cost and regular district cost data is complete on PIF	PIF	67,69	☐
12.02 Compute the percent of program funds obtained from each source indicated in PIF 68. Enter percents on PIF next to dollar amounts.	PIF	68	☐

(SEE NEXT PAGE FOR 12.03)

INVENTORY OF PROGRAM DATA (IPD) PROGRAM CODE NO. _____

NOTE: This chart is to be completed for PACKAGE programs only. Write directly on the form. If necessary, complete tables for each grade level or other group to be included in the packaged information. (Xerox additional charts, if needed.)

12.03 START-UP COST: Include every type of cost paid by the program to initiate it and carry it through its first year of operation (or other appropriate period).

Total START-UP cost paid for by program : $_____
Number of participants included in figure: _____ } $_____ : Per-pupil cost paid by program

Period of time covered by figure: _____
(e.g., academic year, '70-'71)

Grade or group: _____

Directions: Circle either 1, 2, 3, or 4 for each row of boxes, using the code below.

1. The program USED items in this category AND PAID ALL COSTS.
2. The program USED items in this category BUT PAID ONLY PARTIAL COSTS.
3. The program USED items in this category BUT DID NOT PAY ANY OF THESE COSTS.
4. The program DID NOT USE items in this category.

Standard Budget Categories: Use these if possible.		Other Budget Categories***	
ADMINISTRATION/SUPERVISION (salaries, contracted services)	1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4
INSTRUCTION:			
Salaries	1 2 3 4		
Books and Materials	1 2 3 4		
Equipment	1 2 3 4		
ATTENDANCE/HEALTH SERVICES:			
Attendance Services	1 2 3 4		
Health Serivces	1 2 3 4		
PUPIL TRANSPORTATION SERVICES: (mostly salaries, contracted services, insurance, vehicle replacement)	1 2 3 4		
OPERATION OF PLANT (mostly salaries, contracted services, utilities, etc.)	1 2 3 4		
MAINTENANCE OF PLANT (mostly salaries, services, replacement of equipment)	1 2 3 4		
FIXED CHARGES (employee benefits, rental of land and buildings, etc.)	1 2 3 4		

*** If it is necessary to use Other Budget Categories, show category in CAPS and examples of items included in the category in parentheses.

(12.03 IS CONTINUED ON THE NEXT PAGE)

12.03 START-UP costs, continued:

For categories for which you checked Columns 2 or 3 on the chart, please list major items for which you paid only part of the cost or none of the cost.

If inservice training was not covered by the categories shown in the chart, but was required for the program, who paid for it?

Items which were one-time start-up costs: (E.g., building remodeling.)

Other comments on interpreting start-up cost data supplied by the program:

(SEE NEXT PAGE FOR 12.04)

NOTE: This chart is to be completed for PACKAGE programs only. Write directly on the form. If necessary, complete tables for each grade level or other group to be included in the packaged information. (Xerox additional charts, if needed.)

12.04 CONTINUATION COST: Include every type of recurring cost paid by the program after its first year of operation (or other appropriate period used in 12.03).

Total CONTINUATION cost paid for by program: $_____
Number of participants included in figure : _____
} $_____ : Per-pupil cost paid by program

Period of time covered by figure: _____ (e.g., '72-'73 academic year)

Grade or group: _____

Directions: Circle either 1, 2, 3, or 4 for each row of boxes, using the code below.

1. The program USES items in this category AND PAYS ALL COSTS.
2. The program USES items in this category BUT PAYS ONLY PARTIAL COSTS.
3. The program USES items in this category BUT DOES NOT PAY ANY OF THESE COSTS.
4. The program DOES NOT USE items in this category.

Standard Budget Categories: Use these if possible.		Other Budget Categories***	
ADMINISTRATION/SUPERVISION (salaries, contracted services)	1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4
INSTRUCTION:			
Salaries	1 2 3 4		
Books and Materials	1 2 3 4		
Equipment	1 2 3 4		
ATTENDANCE/HEALTH SERVICES:			
Attendance Services	1 2 3 4		
Health Services	1 2 3 4		
PUPIL TRANSPORTATION SERVICES: (mostly salaries, contracted services, insurance, vehicle replacement)	1 2 3 4		
OPERATION OF PLANT (mostly salaries, contracted services, utilities, etc.)	1 2 3 4		
MAINTENANCE OF PLANT (mostly salaries, services, replacement of equipment)	1 2 3 4		
FIXED CHARGES (employee benefits, rental of land and buildings, etc.)	1 2 3 4		

***If it is necessary to use Other Budget Categories, show category in CAPS and examples of items included in the category in parentheses.

(12.04 IS CONTINUED ON THE NEXT PAGE)

12.04 CONTINUATION costs, continued:

For categories for which you checked Columns 2 or 3 on the chart, please list major items for which you pay only part of the cost or none of the cost.

If inservice training is not covered by the categories shown in the chart but is required for continuation of the program, who pays for it?

What was the replacement cost for a class of 30 for consumable items of material and equipment that must be replaced each year?

For materials and equipment that were used for more than one year, what was the replacement cost of these reusable items for a class of 30 at the end of:

2 years?

3 years?

4 years?

5 years?

Other comments on interpreting continuation cost data supplied by the program:

	DOC. NO. See key, IPD p. 3	PAGE OR REF.	NEED MORE INFO
13.00 MODIFICATIONS PLANNED FOR FUTURE			
13.01 Are modifications in the program planned for the future?			☐

OUTLINE FOR THE
INSTRUCTIONAL HANDBOOK

Audience: This handbook is prepared mainly for those who carry out the instructional component of the program. Teachers, and to a lesser degree, principals, supervisors, and coordinators of reading instruction would be included in this group.

Format: Headings in ALL CAPS below should be used in the handbook if at all possible. Use subheadings which best organize the materials you present. REFER TO HANDBOOKS FOR ALPHAPHONICS AND FOR THE ALL DAY KINDERGARTEN for additional format ideas until more handbooks are written.

IPD Ref: IPD references are given to shortcut your search for relevant material. In addition, the PDF WRITEUP and the OE PRESENTATION will be very valuable references, since they incorporate much of the material indexed on the IPD.

IPD REFERENCE

I. PROGRAM OVERVIEW

Instructions
This section can be written almost entirely from the PDF sections which are based on the IPD items noted below. Keep the overview to 300-400 words, or no more than 2 1/2 pages of letter gothic (large) type, double spaced. Do not use subheadings. You do not have to follow this sequence, and you can combine points any way you wish.

A. Identification (very briefly). . . . . IPD 1.00, 6.01

1. Year started
2. Location name
3. Program title
4. Program area (reading, reading readiness, job literacy, etc.)

B. Objectives, main program features/instructional strategies . . . . . IPD 4.00, 9.01

C. Participants . . . . . IPD 2.00, 3.01, 5.01

1. Age, grade, demographic background, special characteristics
2. Selection procedures (test, request, referral, admission panel)
3. Selection criteria (qualifications, background, skills)
4. Number of participants

D. Locale . . . . . IPD 5.02, 5.03

1. Population characteristics of locale which affect program
2. Characteristics of school district or institution/agency which affect program

		IPD REFERENCE
E.	Methodology (may be combined with B above)	IPD 9.00
F.	Personnel	IPD 7.00
G.	Evaluation Results (very brief and nontechnical) . .	(VALIDATOR)

II. STAFF REQUIREMENTS

> Instructions
> Do not reproduce the PDF chart because it is in the Program Management Handbook. Instead, summarize this information in short paragraphs, one for each staff category. If in-service training was provided, summarize it without going into the detail provided in the Program Management Handbook. Refer the reader who wants more detail to that source.

A.	Project staff by category: summarize type, number, time devoted to program, qualifications/experience, activities/duties	IPD 7.01
B.	Inservice: summarize type and extent of inservice training (objectives, training methods/activities) .	IPD 7.01, 7.02

III. TYPICAL SCHEDULE/TIME LINE — IPD 9.04

> Instructions
> Decide on some telegraphic presentation of how program activities are sequenced. You may want to use the schedule from the PDF. You may want to develop the sort of time line which could also be used for the Flow Chart of a participant's progress from program entry to exit (one of the package components). Accompany the graphic presentation with a descriptive, brief narrative which explains it. Refer to the Instructional Handbook for Alphaphonics for an example of presenting and explaining a day's schedule.

IV. PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

Instructions

Although this section will vary widely for different programs, use this general approach: Describe activities generally, then zero in to very specific examples. In Alphaphonics, this section begins with a general summary of activities for a day and a week; a sample lesson plan and worksheet are reproduced (Plates 1 and 2). Then a more detailed description of activities is presented for each day of the week in turn. The last part of the section describes other features of the instructional program. In All Day Kindergarten, most paragraphs or subsections include a general description and specific examples. However you organize this section, cover the following points:

A. Instructional activities . . . . . IPD 9.02
   1. Teaching techniques (specific examples)
   2. Classroom management/motivation techniques
   3. Feedback techniques

B. Grouping patterns used . . . . . IPD 9.03
   1. Purpose of each type of grouping
   2. How frequently used
   3. Description of an event for each grouping

C. On-going diagnosis and assessment of participants . IPD 9.05
   1. Specific reading-related skills/problems measured
   2. Who does what (key persons/roles in diagnosis)
   3. Method/instruments used to measure each skill/problem
   4. Measurement schedule/frequency
   5. Sample copy of individual's diagnostic record or profile (if it would make a good illustration)
   6. Decisions based on measurement (e.g., prescribe individualized instructional program, group students, release from program, other)

D. Special provision for teacher planning (e.g., regular meetings to plan each individual's program, other) . IPD 9.06

IPD REFERENCE

V. SPECIFIC EXAMPLES OF INSTRUCTIONAL PROCEDURES — IPD 9.00

> Instructions
> Sections IV and V should be a valuable resource for a teacher implementing the program at a new site. Important procedures should be described so clearly that a teacher new to the program could try to imitate them. Draw on points under Sections III and IV and elaborate. (See Alphaphonics and ADK.)

VI. PARENT/COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT (if applicable) — IPD 9.08

> Instructions
> There may not be enough to say about this aspect of the program to warrant a separate section. For example, in All Day Kindergarten, a paragraph on parent involvement is included at the end of Section IV as an incidental program feature. However, if this is a well developed component, consider making it a separate section. Cover the following points at least:

A. Specific nature of involvement

B. Concrete results

C. Measures taken to secure their support

VII. EQUIPMENT, MATERIALS, AND FACILITIES

> Instructions
> It may be more appropriate to cover facilities (C) in section IV without separating your description from the discussion of activities. See All Day Kindergarten for an example of how A and B can be covered to make this a very useful section for the teachers in your audience.

A. Major items of equipment and material required for program . . . . . IPD 11.01

B. Purpose/procedures for use of each key item (related to specific instructional events) . . . . . IPD 11.02

C. Description, special construction/alterations required for program facilities . . . . . IPD 10.01, 10.02

VIII. PROVISIONS FOR TEACHERS TO MODIFY FEATURES OF THE PROGRAM — IPD 9.06

IPD REFERENCE

IX. QUOTED SOURCES (documents) IPD 1.02

Instructions
Using correct bibliographic format, give entries for any documents from which you lifted material to include in this Handbook. Lifting means quoting words or using program material as illustrative plates.

X. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION (program contacts) IPD 1.01

Instructions
Indicate for one or two contacts which you have cleared with program staff. See Alphaphonics and All Day Kindergarten for examples of this section.

OUTLINE FOR THE
PROGRAM MANAGEMENT HANDBOOK

Audience: This handbook is prepared for people with the authority to make or to recommend changes in existing educational practices. Superintendents of instruction, reading supervisors and coordinators, and principals would be included in this group.

Format: Headings in ALL CAPS below have to be used in the handbook. Use subheadings which best organize the material you present. REFER TO HANDBOOKS FOR ALPHAPHONICS AND FOR THE ALL DAY KINDERGARTEN for additional format ideas until more handbooks are written.

IPD REFERENCE

I. PROGRAM OVERVIEW

> Instructions
> Without omitting important information, shorten the same Program Overview you prepared for the Instructional Handbook to 200-300 words. This is about 1½ plus pages of letter gothic (large) type.

II. HOW THE PROGRAM DEVELOPED

> Instructions
> Report information which is important, not just nice, for the audience to know. See this section in the Program Management Handbook for All Day Kindergarten and Alphaphonics for the sort of information that is considered essential background.

A. Initial stimulus for program (effort of key person, outgrowth of earlier effort) . . . . . IPD 6.02

B. Needs assessment (if applicable) . . . . . IPD 6.03

1. By whom
2. Methods/instruments
3. Needs selected for program (priorities)
4. Who makes these decisions
5. Useful materials for package (items that would make a good illustration)

C. Planning process (before program began) . . . . . IPD 6.04

1. Major steps
2. Key persons/roles in major planning tasks
3. Useful materials for package (e.g., flow charts, time lines, calendars, or other items which could be reproduced as illustrations)

IPD REFERENCE

D. Implementation process . . . . . IPD 6.05

1. Major steps
2. Key persons/roles in major implementation tasks
3. Effective/ineffective procedures
4. Useful materials for package (e.g., C3 above)

E. Changes in program from original plan . . . . . IPD 6.06
(If applicable, this may fit better under D unless changes were very substantial and deserve discussion in a separate section,)

1. How (changes in goals, activities, staff, etc.)
2. Why (recruitment problems, community pressure, budget cuts)

F. Program's growth since it began . . . . . IPD 6.07

III. HOW THE PROGRAM IS STAFFED

Inservice
Reproduce the chart from the PDF except for the column on Qualifications. Number the X's in the chart. Below the chart, use corresponding numbers for paragraphs which explain the X's. If there is a lot of information on inservice training which calls for a separate section on that component, try the format illustrated in the Program Management Handbook for the All Day Kindergarten.

A. Tabular presentation of type, number time devoted to program, and special requirements re role or inservice training . . . . . IPD 7.01 (PDF)

B. Problems in recruiting or maintaining staff (incentives to attract staff, teachers allowed to leave program) . . . . . IPD 7.03

C. Inservice training in detail (may call for separate section) . . . . . IPD 7.02

1. Specific objectives
2. Key persons/roles in planning/conducting
3. When and where (sample schedule)
4. Instructional methods/activities
5. Assessment of staff proficiency in skills taught

IPD REFERENCE

IV. HOW THE PROGRAM IS MANAGED

> Instruction
> There will be wide variation among programs in this section. Two extremes are exemplified by the Program Management Handbooks for Alphaphonics and for the All Day Kindergarten; however, in each case there was important information which could be presented for A, B, and C.

A. Chain of command . . . . . IPD 8.01

1. Protocol for who tells whom what (chart if appropriate)
2. Day-to-day situations in which this routine is modified to facilitate program management
3. Procedures for decision-making re unsolicited advice from teachers, students, and parents

B. Periodic review of programs (process evaluation) . . IPD 8.02

1. Program procedures assessed
2. Who does what (key persons/roles)
3. Method/instruments used
4. Measurement schedule/frequency
5. Major decisions made on basis of review
6. Who makes these decisions

C. Opinions of program staff re most essential management techniques for replicating programs (indicate identity of person expressing the opinion) . . . . . IPD 8.03

V. HOW THE PROGRAM IS BUDGETED

Instructions	
The IPD cost charts:	You may or may not have been able to complete the top of the charts, but certainly you were able to get some inkling of how the program was budgeted by getting information for the rest of the chart. A special case is the program which is paid for out of the regular district budget. See below.
Presenting cost data:	Present whatever information you could obtain in a way which will help the reader budget the program in his own situation. If the kind of information you got can be presented under cost categories, use the ones in the charts plus additional ones you need. Refer to the format for the All Day Kindergarten cost section if you were able to make use of the IPD charts. If your program did not require funds beyond the money provided by the regular school program, just talk about budgeting for necessary program supplies or activities. See PLC for assistance on this section if you want to.

A. Start-up cost . . . . . IPD 12.03

1. Give cost data at top of IPD chart if program gave it to you
2. Interpret cost data via supplementary information you got in filling out rest of chart and in answers to questions on IPD page 15
3. If 1 and/or 2 are not possible, summarize what you did get (e.g., major items of expense which should be considered in budgeting the first year of the program)

B. Continuation cost . . . . . IPD 12.04

1. Same as A1
2. Same as A2, except refer to questions on IPD page 17
3. Same as A3, but hopefully there will be something to say under each major cost category when you do B2

IPD REFERENCE

C. Summary (PDF)

If yours is a fairly long cost section (see All Day Kindergarten), pull together the most important points the reader should keep in mind in budgeting for this program. Refer back to the cost section of the PDF which may contain information not yet covered in the preceding cost paragraphs. The Summary could go at either end of the cost section.

VI. HOW THE PROGRAM IS EVALUATED

Instructions
Get a validator to write this according to the format used in the Program Management Handbooks for Alphaphonics and the All Day Kindergarten. In general, this section covers the following: tests used, comparison methods, and data analysis. The style should match your style.

VII. MODIFICATIONS PLANNED FOR FUTURE IPD 13.00

Instructions
Any possibly important future modification--of staff utilization, program design, classroom activities, inservice training--should be mentioned in this section.

VIII. QUOTED SOURCES (documents) IPD 1.02

Instructions
Using correct bibliographic format, give entries for any documents from which you lifted material to include in this Handbook. Lifting means quoting words or using program material as illustrative plates.

IX. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION (program contacts) IPD 1.01

Instructions
Indicate for one or two contacts which you have cleared with program staff. See Alphaphonics and All Day Kindergarten for examples of this section.

APPENDIX F

Sample Program Description for the Catalog of Reading Programs

ENRICHED AND EXTENDED SCHOOL YEAR PROGRAM
EAST CLEVELAND, OHIO

PROGRAM SIZE AND TARGET POPULATION

About 1,500 children from 5 elementary schools are in this program. Almost 100% are black and come from an inner-city community in which family income is low, with 50% of the school children from welfare families.

YEAR STARTED

The program began in 1971.

STAFF

The administrative staff consists of a program coordinator, a coordinator of supportive services, a budgetary manager, and an evaluation adviser. There are 60 teachers, assisted by 10 paraprofessionals, all of whom participate in ongoing inservice training sessions. Thirty specialists in the fields of art, music, drama, science, history, and health provide additional instruction.

MAJOR FEATURES

Children selected for this program show a deficit in reading achievement equivalent to 1½ years or more. The program focuses on strengthening reading, vocabulary, and communication skills through the addition of nontraditional settings for instruction and the extension of the school year through July. The extended year is organized into six 6-week segments. Each segment includes 4 weeks of traditional classroom instruction, 1 week of special instruction at one of several community cultural institutions, and 1 week of vacation. Scheduling varies, but all classes spend 5 days, not necessarily consecutively, within each 6-week period at one of the institutions. The teacher and specialist from each cultural center use part of the 1-week vacation time to plan activities for the following instructional period. The activities are designed to enrich classroom experiences while also teaching vocabulary and oral communication skills. For these 5 days, the institution specialist becomes the teacher, and the teacher becomes an active participant in the program. At the end of the 5 days, both teachers meet for a feedback session. Participating cultural centers are the Cleveland Art Museum, the Music Settlement House, Fairmount Center for Creative and Performing Arts, the Cleveland Health Museum, Hiram College (Center of Biological Studies), Western Reserve Historical Society, Cleveland Zoo, the Cleveland Natural Science Museum, Resident Camp, and Karamu House Theatre. Integrated into the regular classroom curriculum is time for the children to write about their experiences at these institutions. They are encouraged to use their new vocabulary in diary entries, and learning to read by writing augments their regular reading lessons. In addition to planning activities, teachers schedule parent conferences and tutor students during the 1-week vacation periods.

FACILITIES, MATERIALS, EQUIPMENT

This program uses the facilities of the cultural centers already mentioned. This includes classroom, gallery, and workshop space and supplies and equipment for special projects.

COST

The total cost of instructional materials for a class of 30 is $6,000. In addition, each cultural center is paid an average of $15 per pupil per week of instruction. The average, annual per-pupil cost for the regular district program is $1,000. The annual per-pupil cost of this program exceeds that by $200.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

Lawrence R. Perney
Assistant Superintendent
East Cleveland Board of Education
15305 Terrace Road
East Cleveland, Ohio 44112